Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-074 CONTENTS *17 April 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- Admiral Tallies Pacific Fleet Force Reductions *[TASS]* ... 1
- CSCE 'Conflict Prevention' Center Meets *[TASS]* ... 1
- U.S. INF Inspection Team Arrives in Ulan-Ude *[TASS]* ... 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Paris Forum on European Security Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]* ... 2
- Pavlov Meets Israel's Shamir, EBRD's Attali *[TASS]* ... 3
- Bessmertnykh Writes UN Chief on Afghanistan *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* ... 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Bush Against Renewed Anti-Iraq Hostilities *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* ... 4
- Pentagon Official Cited on Intelligence Cuts *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* ... 4
- VOA Cited on Georgia Status as Union Republic *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 12 Apr]* ... 4
- Soviet Sailors Seek Refugee Status in Halifax *[Montreal International]* ... 4

Northeast Asia

- Gorbachev Visits Khabarovsk en Route to Japan ... 5
  - Visits Japanese War-Dead Cemetery *[PRAVDA 16 Apr]* ... 5
  - Answers Citizens Questions *[Moscow TV]* ... 5
  - PRAVDA Report on Visit *[16 Apr]* ... 6
- Gorbachev Begins First-Ever Visit to Tokyo ... 9
  - Arrives, Met by Nakayama *[TASS]* ... 9
  - Meets Emperor Akihito *[TASS]* ... 10
  - Talks With Kaifu 16 Apr *[TASS]* ... 10
  - Ignatenko Cited on Kaifu Talks *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Apr]* ... 11
  - Akihito Speech at Banquet *[PRAVDA 17 Apr]* ... 11
  - Gorbachev Speech at Banquet *[TASS]* ... 12
  - PRAVDA on Reaction to Visit *[17 Apr]* ... 12
  - Japanese Reportage on Visit *[cross-reference]* ... 13
- ROK Envoy Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* ... 13
- North Korea Expected To Resume North-South Talks *[Moscow International]* ... 14

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Singapore's Goh Criticized on U.S. Bases View *[Moscow International]* ... 14
- Concessions From Cambodian Resistance Urged *[Moscow International]* ... 15
- Moscow Views Bangkok's Indochina Policy *[Moscow International]* ... 15

Near East & South Asia

- Pavlov, Shamir Discuss Bilateral Ties in London *[Moscow Radio]* ... 16
- Najibullah Sends Messages to Gorbachev, Bush *[TASS]* ... 16
- Moscow Protests Pakistani 'Interference' *[Moscow International]* ... 17
- TASS Reports Isayev Views on Mideast Solutions ... 17
- Primakov Receives Iranian Ambassador in Moscow *[TASS]* ... 17

East Europe

- Walesa Cited on Troop Withdrawal, Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 17
- Talks on Troop Withdrawal From Poland Viewed *[Moscow International]* 17
- Commander on 'Secret Nuclear Garrisons' in Poland *[Warsaw PAP]* 18
- Yanayev Receives Polish Senate Leader *[Warsaw PAP]* 18
- Documents on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Signed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA]* 18

West Europe

- Supreme Soviet Chairman Departs for France *[TASS]* 18
- Tourists Without Visas Refused Entry to Rome *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Apr]* 19

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

- Committee's Conclusion on Miners' Demands *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* 20
- IZVESTIYA Reports 15 Apr Proceedings *[16 Apr]* 21
- Moscow TV Details 16 Apr Proceedings 22

Political & Social

- Ivashko Interviewed on Upcoming CPSU Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Apr]* 23
- Gorbachev Aide Interviewed on Upcoming Plenum *[Milan L'UNITA 14 Apr]* 24
- Leningrad Obkom Proposes Agenda for Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Apr]* 25
- Gorbachev Should Resign 'At Least' One Post *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 26
- Moscow Journalists Union Expels Kravchenko *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 29
  - Union To Investigate Expulsion *[Radio Rossii]* 29
- Radio Rossii on Visit by Dissident Bukovskiy 29
- General Kalugin Discusses KGB Activities *[Budapest NEPSZAVA 11 Apr]* 29
- Shenin, Ivashko View CPSU Registration *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Apr]* 30
- Gorbachev Aide Dzasokhov Profiled *[MOSCOW NEWS No 10]* 31
- Advisory Group Drafts Anti-Crisis Program *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Mar]* 31
- TASS Reviews Central Press for 17 Apr 52

Economic

- Further Reportage on Mine Strikes, Results 53
  - Raspadskaya Mine Ends Strike *[TASS]* 53
  - 'Complete' Collapse Possible *[TASS]* 53
  - 'Only Losers' From Strike Losses *[Moscow TV]* 54
- Sverdlovsk TU Calls for Warning Political Strike *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Apr]* 54
- Jan-Mar Figures Reveal 'Unwelcome Trends' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* 54
- Union Budget Deficit Termed 'Catastrophic' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Apr]* 55
- USSR Law on Business Activity Published *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 57
  - Enabling Decree *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* 59
- Details of Western Ruble Speculation Aired *[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Mar]* 60

Military

- 'Great Power' Status Requires Retaining Kurils *[AFP]* 63
- General Staff Deputy Chief on Far East Balance *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* 63
- Air Defense Forces Chief Tretyak Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 65
- Moscow Garrison Party Secretaries Hold Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Apr]* 66

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- Baltic Veterans Note Forces' 'Responsibility' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Apr]* 68

- Soviet Delegation Arrives in Estonia 14 Apr *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 68
  - Delegations Discuss Ties, Plans *[TASS]* ... 68
  - 'Ice Has Been Broken' *[Moscow TV]* ... 68
- Estonian Prime Minister Meets Urals Miners *[Tallinn International]* ... 69
- Estonian CP Official Reviews Party's Role *[TASS]* ... 69
- Baltic Council Leaders Meet in Latvia ... 69
  - Show Concern Over Negotiations *[Moscow International]* ... 69
  - Reject Moldova's Call for Merger *[Tallinn International]* ... 69
  - Appeal to Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* ... 70
- Lithuania Wary of Soviet Media Takeover *[Vilnius International]* ... 70
- Continuing Reportage on Lithuanian-Soviet Talks ... 70
  - Conditions for Talks Detailed *[TIESA 9 Apr]* ... 70
  - Ozolas Doubts USSR's Serious Preparation *[EKHO LITVY 5 Apr]* ... 71
  - Stankevicius Views Meeting *[EKHO LITVY 6 Apr]* ... 72
- Lithuanian Council Passes Agrarian Reform Law *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 72
- Decline in Lithuanian Economic Indicators Noted *[Vilnius International]* ... 72
- Attacks on Lithuanian Communists Detailed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Apr]* ... 72
- Lithuanian Prime Minister Departs for Canada *[TASS]* ... 73
- Ligachev Memoirs Recall Lithuania Debates *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Apr]* ... 73

RSFSR

- Yeltsin Pays 'Unofficial' Visit to France ... 76
  - Visit To Strengthen Ties *[TASS]* ... 76
  - Meets With Baron, Lalumiere *[TASS]* ... 76
  - Baron Comments on Meeting *[TASS]* ... 77
  - Holds Strasbourg News Conference *[TASS]* ... 77
  - PRAVDA Reports Visit *[16 Apr]* ... 77
  - To Meet Perez De Cuellar *[Radio Rossii]* ... 78
  - Meets French Assembly President *[TASS]* ... 78
  - Denies Split With Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 17 Apr]* ... 78
- Further Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to France *[cross-reference]* ... 79
- Moscow To Create Municipal Police Force *[Radio Rossii]* ... 79
- RSFSR Presidential Candidates Considered *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Apr]* ... 79
- Shakhray Discusses New Powers, Presidency *[Moscow TV]* ... 80
- Organizing Committee for Science Academy Named *[IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]* ... 81
- Kursk Plenum Attacks 'Apostate' Rutskoy *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* ... 81

Western Republics

- Minsk Strikers Demand Union Chief's Resignation *[Moscow Radio]* ... 81
- Ukrainian Strike Committee Established 16 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* ... 81
  - Rallies Support Strikes *[Moscow TV]* ... 82
  - TASS on Rally's Demands ... 82
  - Supreme Soviet Rules Against Strikes *[Moscow Radio]* ... 82
- Ukraine Suspends Gorbachev Resources Decree *[TASS]* ... 83
- Ukraine Government, TU Appeal to Kiev Workers *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* ... 83
- Gurenko Against Treaty's 'Hasty Signing' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 apr]* ... 84
- Ukraine Prime Minister Comments on Prise Rises *[Radio Rossii]* ... 84
- Ukrainian Student Groups Merge *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Apr]* ... 84
- Union Deputies From Ukraine Defend Efforts *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 27 Mar]* ... 85

Caucasus

- Gamsakhurdia Issues Disobedience Decree 15 Apr ... 86
  - Actions Aim To Achieve Independence *[Tbilisi Radio]* ... 86
  - Roundtable Urges Protest Actions *[Tbilisi Radio]* ... 86
- Reportage on Situation in South Ossetia ... 86
  - Large Weapons Seizure *[TASS]* ... 86
  - Rockets Fired, Hostages Taken *[Tbilisi Radio]* ... 87
  - No Shooting in Tskhinvali 14-15 Apr *[Tbilisi Radio]* ... 87

Too Early for 'Positive Changes' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Apr]* 87
Georgian Rail Situation 'Gradually Improving' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]* 87
Armenia Appeals To Renew Transport *[TASS]* 87
Strike Cuts Off Armenia 'Completely' *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Georgian Trade Unions Appeal for Support *[Tbilisi Radio]* 88
Form Strike Committee *[Tbilisi Radio]* 88
National Program Called Armenian Party's Salvation *[HAYASTAN 2 Apr]* 88
'Bandit Attacks' Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh *[Yerevan Radio]* 88
NKAO Residency Act Move Against Armenians *[ARMENPRES]* 89
Yerevan Says Moscow Behind Region's Tensions *[ARMENPRESS]* 89
Reportage on Armenian, Azerbaijani Relations *[TASS]* 89
'Tense' Border Situation, Armenian Attacks Noted *[Baku Radio]* 90

Central Asia

Constituent Congress for New Kazakh TU Held *[IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]* 90
Retail Sales of Kyrgyz Newspapers Suspended *[TRUD 11 Apr]* 90
Turkmenia Aiming for Self-Sufficiency in Grain *[PRAVDA 12 Apr]* 91
No Price Increase on Bread in Uzbekistan *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Apr]* 91
Tajik Law on Registration of Enterprises *[cross-reference]* 91
Turkmen Law on 1991 Development Plan *[cross-reference]* 91
Uzbek Draft Law on Business Undertakings *[cross-reference]* 91
Uzbek Law on 1991 State Budget *[cross-reference]* 91

Admiral Tallies Pacific Fleet Force Reductions

LD1704041991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Vladivostok, 16 Apr (TASS)—A meeting of political scientists from the USSR, the United States, China and Japan on Asian security problems has been held in Vladivostok. Some participants expressed concern over allegations that the potential of the Pacific Fleet is increasing, its actions off the shores of Japan are being stepped up, and there are incidents of Soviet planes violating this [Japan] country's air space. A TASS correspondent asked Admiral G. Khvatov, commander of the Pacific Fleet, to clarify the situation.

"It is true," the admiral said, "that two years ago a note from the Foreign Ministry of Japan alleged that its air space was violated by a plane of our fleet. However, the above episode is highly disputed. As for increasing the potential of the fleet and stepping up its actions, facts prove the opposite. Judge for yourselves. In recent years the number of exercises and the strength of the personnel taking part in them have been reduced, the area where Soviet nuclear submarines operate has been restricted to coastal zones, and the sailing of warships in the Indian Ocean has been cut down to the minimum necessary for ensuring the safety of our shipping in that region. All exercises of the Pacific Fleet are held in accordance with the provisions of the Soviet defense doctrine".

The Soviet military chief noted that the armament of the USSR Navy is being reduced unilaterally. As recently as 1989-1990, 16 nuclear-powered and 24 diesel-powered submarines, 41 surface ships and 25 combatant craft were taken out of its force composition. A total of 16 units from this list are from the Pacific Fleet. These figures do not require any further comment.

"We are interested in an exchange of objective military information. I am convinced that this process should be placed on a firm basis of a treaty. We are ready for this," the admiral stressed.

CSCE 'Conflict Prevention' Center Meets

LD1604183191 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna, 16 April (TASS)—The search for and testing of new principles for relations between states and the development of new approaches to security that will meet the criteria of the new epoch are the core of the European process, according to speeches by representatives from various states at a meeting of the consultative committee of the Conflict Prevention Centre, held here today.

The new institution of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), an important mechanism in Europe's future structures from the Atlantic to the Urals, was established in compliance with decisions taken by the Paris summit and opened in Vienna in mid-March.

The Centre is now oriented only on confidence-building measures and security. However, the Centre also plans to help prevent conflicts. But the programme for these activities has yet to be drafted.

Head of the Soviet delegation at the Vienna talks Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS that the Centre's activities will be discussed in the future.

At the same time it is logical to suppose that the Centre will strive to be efficient and flexible, enabling its members to use all the levers and experience of the CSCE, including experience accumulated during the Vienna talks, to prevent developments that could threaten peace, security and stability of CSCE states, Grinevskiy noted.

The present consultative committee meeting discussed the establishment of the Centre's data bank, which will accumulate various military information from all the 34 CSCE member-states.

The session of the Joint Consultative Group of Experts (JCGE) continued to specify initial data on military arsenals covered by the Conventional Forces in Europe treaty. The session held its regular plenary meeting in the Austrian capital today.

The group was set up to monitor the observance of the above document, signed at the Paris summit.

JCGE experts believe that the analysis of information, supplied by member-countries, shows that additional discussions at various levels are needed to remove possible questions concerning data on military forces.

During the session, the Soviet side intends to give specifications concerning initial data on the Soviet Armed Forces covered by the CFE Treaty. In turn, it has some questions concerning initial data supplied by other states.

U.S. INF Inspection Team Arrives in Ulan-Ude

LD1604182591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1708 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By correspondent Sergey Trofimov]

[Text] Ulan-Ude, 16 Apr (TASS)—A U.S. Air Force Starlifter-141 transport aircraft landed today at the airport of the capital of Buryatia (a Soviet republic within Russia in Transcaucasia). It brought to Ulan-Ude ten U.S. inspectors working within the framework of the Treaty on the Reduction of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles [INF].

"We have come to Buryatia to carry out an inspection within the framework of the INF Treaty signed in Washington in December 1987," U.S. Air Force Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Jablonski the leader of the group, told a TASS correspondent. "Today's visit to Ulan-Ude is the hundredth since the start of mutual inspections. We have always met with mutual understanding here, and there have been no problems. We start work tomorrow."

The U.S. inspectors were met at the airport by representatives of the USSR National Center for Reducing Nuclear Danger.

Paris Forum on European Security Reported

PM1604105591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Captain S. Sidorov report: "Paris, Moscow, Washington: Security Is Impossible Without Cooperation"]

[Text] "European Security. What Form Should It Take at the Turn of the Century?" An international forum, which was held in the French capital and brought together some 2,000 security experts beneath the domes of the Higher School of French Land Forces [Ecole Superieure de Guerre], was devoted to this extremely topical issue. It was also attended by students from the higher military education establishments of 17 countries, including representatives of the USSR. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's international observer followed the course of the meeting. We publish his notes.

The conference participants exchanged opinions on a broad range of questions, from the prospects for setting up an all-European collective security system to the problems of disarmament and military industry conversion. Moreover, the discussion was not limited to an examination of the purely military aspects of security, as is evidenced by the profound understanding both by the public and by the future military leaders of the countries represented of the importance of the economic, cultural, diplomatic, scientific research, and other elements of security. In my view, this understanding was expressed clearly enough by V. Zagladin, head of the Soviet delegation in Paris and chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, who stressed that the starting point for any security system should be the security of each individual person.

The concluding session of the conference took place with the aid of a satellite linkup that joined the audience in Paris with students from the National Defense University in Washington and the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy in Moscow. A brief exposition of their vision of a future European security system was given by authoritative figures like Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev, adviser to the USSR president; NATO Secretary General M. Woerner; and B. Scowcroft, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs.

On the whole the nature of the speeches and the ensuing brief but intense debate reflected the current state of the European process. Whereas the sides were unanimous in their positive assessment of the major military-political changes that have taken place in the world and especially in Europe in recent years, there was no unanimity in their assessment of ways to deepen these processes.

B. Scowcroft, for example, saw the way forward in a strengthening of the "leading role of America" which, in the opinion of the administration he represents, has emerged from the Persian Gulf conflict as something totally new—the only superpower in the world. Needless to say, as participants in bilateral and multilateral dialogue with the Americans, we cannot avoid facing the complex question posed by attitudes of this sort: How do we conduct business with them from now on?

M. Woerner put forward a quite contradictory position as well. On the one hand, he confirmed NATO's intention to develop relations with the Soviet Union in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendship, but on the other hand he spoke in favor of maintaining the alliance's military organization, albeit with a lower level of arms and a changed strategy. Meanwhile, Woerner is well aware that the Soviet Union, whose understanding is being relied on, is reasonably interpreting the alliance's future in a different way: If the Warsaw Pact's military organization no longer exists, neither, consequently, should NATO's. In trying to substantiate his viewpoint, Woerner unconvincingly referred to the instability of the internal political situation in the Soviet Union, and then reinforced the thesis of NATO's "strictly defensive" character by stating that the alliance lacks an "offensive potential," which came as a big surprise to the fairly well informed students from the General Staff Academy.

There was also a speech from an East European representative—Polish politician B. Geremek—who expressed his concern at the "Soviet side's dragging its feet over the schedule for withdrawing its troops from Poland." In this context he expressed the fear that this was being done "deliberately," and could therefore be seen, in his opinion, as a sign of the Soviet leadership's recoil back to the pre-perestroyka period. I shall not set forth the counterarguments adduced by the Soviet participants in the television link. These are obvious for all who are familiar with the problems of the withdrawal. I will merely note that this is not the first time that hints of "a growing conservative influence on the Kremlin's policy" and even of "a military conspiracy against Gorbachev" have been heard. They have been put with particular eloquence by former FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt, who for some reason attributed conspiratorial aims specifically to the "marshals," almost all of whom, incidentally, retired long ago, just like the former chancellor.

The marshal had to give an answer. As far as was possible in the space of one or two minutes, Presidential Adviser S. Akhromeyev stated fully and cogently that the military leadership and the "marshals" are not only committed to changes, but are also taking an active part in them. Moreover, the Armed Forces are the guarantor of the peaceful progress of the transformations that are taking place in our country. In fact, would it really have been possible to start implementing a major program of troop and arms reduction without the participation of the military?

However, the entirely explicable contradictions that came out in the speeches by participants in the television linkup—it would have been strange if there had not been any—were just a minor detail. But the recurrent theme was still a desire to arrive at a common denominator. Ultimately everybody had one aim—the creation of a regional security system that would guarantee reliable peace and security for all peoples and states. It remains only to agree with the main idea in French President F. Mitterand's statement, who delivered the closing speech to the forum participants: The political prerequisite for such a system already exists, namely the Paris Charter for a new Europe. It is up to the Europeans to realize the potential contained therein through cooperation and collaboration.

Pavlov Meets Israel's Shamir, EBRD's Attali

LD1604173991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] London 16 Apr (TASS)—On 16 April, there was a working meeting between USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov and J. Attali, who was elected president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD] the previous day.

J. Attali expounded his ideas on the main directions of the bank's work in the nearest period. He noted that, in order to tackle the enormous tasks of providing assistance to the Soviet Union with carrying out the program of reforms for transferring to a market economy, the bank will devote attention to the study of concrete economic projects; to realize these in the USSR, the financial resources both of the bank itself and of other financial institutions from the countries acting as its founders could be involved.

During the conversation, the question was discussed of the most expedient areas of the Soviet economy in which the EBRD might in the near future provide the Soviet Union with assistance with creating the conditions for the emergence of independent producers and for the development of competition to expand the processing of agricultural produce and the production of consumer goods, and to promote the faster organization of financial institutions and mechanisms of a market type.

On 16 April, USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov held a meeting with U.S. Treasury Secretary N. Brady.

There was an exchange of views on matters of Soviet-U.S. economic relations. N. Brady reported on the progress of the consideration by the U.S. Administration of the opportunity of providing credits for commodity purchase, and expressed the hope that a positive solution may be found in the near future. The importance was stressed of continuing regular contacts between Soviet and U.S. representatives at government level, which would facilitate further mutual understanding and the expansion of joint actions.

A significant portion of the conversation was taken up with a discussion of the prospects for cooperation between the USSR and the EBRD and the arrangements for direct contacts with the IMF, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other international economic organizations.

Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov, who is in London in connection with the official opening of the EBRD, had a meeting on 16 April with Y. Shamir, prime minister of Israel, at the latter's request.

The central theme of the conversation, which determined its political content, was the question of a universal peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict which would take into full account the justified concerns of all sides. The participants in the conversation displayed understanding of the necessity to coordinate the efforts of the Soviet Union and Israel in the matter of a Middle East settlement. It was agreed that the quest for compromise solutions to the conflict should be continued.

An exchange of opinions also took place on a number of questions of bilateral Soviet-Israeli relations including the political, economic, and cultural spheres.

The conversation took place in an atmosphere of goodwill.

Bessmertnykh Writes UN Chief on Afghanistan

PM1704111791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report: "USSR Foreign Minister's Letter"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh has sent UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar a letter on the continuing conflict in Afghanistan and the escalation of military operations in that country. The letter emphasizes that everything must be done to make 1991 the year of reaching an Afghan political settlement. The need to observe the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan is noted, and a high assessment is made of the peacemaking role of the United Nations in the search for ways to unblock the conflict.

United States & Canada

Bush Against Renewed Anti-Iraq Hostilities

PM1604153991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Blinov report: "United States-Iraq: U.S. Troops' Withdrawal"]

[Text] Washington—Over the last few days the United States has increased its aid to the Iraqi Kurds. However, statements by leading administration figures indicate that there is no question of using U.S. Armed Forces to intervene in Iraq.

Addressing students at the Air Force Academy [as published] at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, last Saturday, U.S. President G. Bush rejected most definitely any possibility of resuming hostilities against the Iraqi regime.

G. Bush stressed that he does not want "even one soldier or airman to be involved in the years-long civil war in Iraq." The U.S. President advocated that the Iraqi people themselves decide their future.

In a speech devoted mainly to the overall foreign policy concept of a "new world order," the U.S. President's statement is seen as responding to criticism of the administration's action in the Congress and certain press organs. The authors of this criticism pointed to the "sluggishness" of the administration's reaction to the acuteness of the Kurdish refugee problem. They think that the scale of the Kurdish problem turned out to be an unexpected result of the war against Iraq, although it was the White House that called for the Iraqi people to rise up against Saddam Husayn's regime.

At the same time, the administration leadership learned the results of public opinion polls in the United States: Most of the country's population advocate U.S. soldiers' returning home.

U.S. Secretary of Defense R. Cheney and B. Scowcroft, the President's national security adviser, said in television interviews Sunday that U.S. soldiers would be withdrawn within the next few days from the bulk of the territory of southern Iraq that they are occupying. According to R. Cheney, U.S. troops will be withdrawn to the buffer zone between Iraq and Kuwait (it occupies a strip 10 km into Iraqi territory and 5 km into Kuwaiti territory). They will remain there until observers from the UN forces arrive. The troops' withdrawal will take several days.

B. Scowcroft pointed out that, during the planning of hostilities against Iraq last fall, the administration leadership laid down the operation's specific goals—the liberation of Kuwait and the defeat of the Iraqi war machine. These goals have been achieved and the administration has no intention of going beyond them.

According to B. Scowcroft, the United States had no desire to intervene in the civil war in Iraq even after warning Baghdad against using troops in the north of the country. This warning, he said, is only designed to ensure the security of operations to aid the Kurdish refugees. The de facto "safe haven" in northern Iraq which thus emerged constitutes a temporary solution. An opportunity must be found in the future for the refugees to return to their homes. The United States would not like to see a situation in this region similar to that on the (Israeli-occupied) West Bank of the Jordan.

Pentagon Official Cited on Intelligence Cuts

PM1604135191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report under general heading "24 Hours"]

[Text] United States—The Pentagon intends to curb its intelligence apparatus. This was announced by U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Duane Andrews. This step is aimed at eliminating duplication in the work of individual intelligence organs and boosting its effectiveness, while at the same time reducing expenditure. According to Andrews, the need for an intelligence shake-up has been brought about by changing world conditions. "There is the general opinion that the intelligence structure is inadequately prepared for the future. The world has changed. It is changing very rapidly and intelligence must adapt to that," the assistant secretary of defense said.

VOA Cited on Georgia Status as Union Republic

91UF0642A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 12 Apr 91 p 3

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Live Broadcast"]

[Text]"The Voice of America"

...The State Department says that Georgia was already part of the Soviet state when the United States recognized the USSR in 1933. Since then, the United States has never questioned Georgia's status as a Union republic.

This statement from the State Department was a reaction to a statement by Gamsakhurdia in an interview for the Voice of America, in which he indicated his intention to appeal to foreign states to recognize Georgia as an independent state.

In this interview, the president of Georgia emphasized that his country already is a de facto independent republic and does not recognize the Soviet Constitution.

Soviet Sailors Seek Refugee Status in Halifax

LD1604163591 Montreal International Service in English 1600 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] At least three Soviet sailors are seeking refugee status in eastern Canada, and it appears six more may do the same. The development is occuring in Halifax, Nova Scotia, where a large number of Soviet fishing and cargo ships are visiting. A Canadian immigration lawyer says the Soviets may be defecting because they feel there is less danger of recrimination against their families during the Gorbachev reign.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Visits Khabarovsk en Route to Japan

Visits Japanese War-Dead Cemetery

PM1504220591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by L. Pyatiletova and TASS correspondent: "The Horizons of Creation and Cooperation. M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Khabarovsk"]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 15 Apr—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev stopped off here today on his way to Japan on an official visit. The program of his stay started with a visit to the memorial commemorating the feats of the inhabitants of Khabarovsk who gave their lives for victory in the Great Patriotic War.

The memorial wall of combat glory surrounds the Eternal Flame like a pair of wings protecting it solicitously. There are over 20,000 names of fallen heroes on the black labradorite wall with overhanging flags made of red granite.

The president laid a wreath at the Eternal Flame.

At this place—and how many similar ones there are in our country!—the feeling of grief for those who have died and gratitude for the fact that they shielded the Fatherland with their breasts is inevitably accompanied by the equally strong and deep feeling that begs that the peace that was won at such a high price be cherished like the apple of our eye. That it be protected and strengthened.

The red roses from the president lay at the foot of the V.I. Lenin memorial in the center of the city.

There is perhaps a special sign in the fact that M.S. Gorbachev also laid flowers at the Japanese cemetery in Khabarovsk, where the prisoners of war from the former Kwantung Army who died here are buried.

We are all witnessing the powerful wave of the new thinking washing away conflict more and more and clearing a space for cooperation. That is, for preserving and strengthening peace. You can see a mutual desire for this noble aim. I would like to believe that the Soviet leader's visit to the Land of the Rising Sun which begins tomorrow will be convincing confirmation of this. And the flowers on the Japanese graves in Khabarovsk are being seen as a humane mark of good-neighborliness.

At this cemetery you remember and become convinced yet again that all of us in this world are human beings and we must remain human beings, Mikhail Sergeyevich noted.

Another wreath was also laid—at the stone laid to the memory of the victims of Stalinist repressions.

Then M.S. Gorbachev took part in a conference of the kray's soviet, public, and economic leaders. For over two hours those gathered told the president openly about what had changed in the life of the region in the time since 1986 and which problems they managed to resolve and which ones, on the contrary, had become even more acute. But regardless of the Khabarovsk inhabitants' numerous problems and unresolved questions, their mood during their meeting with the president was businesslike—a fact that you could not help noticing. In practically every speech proposals were made about how to achieve a situation whereby the Far East could embark on the path of radical renewal.

The president supported many of these proposals in his concluding speech. He agreed that we need to turn to the program for the development of the Far East in the immediate future, not on the former command principles, but on the basis of the partners' mutual interests. Special attention will also be paid to questions of the region's international cooperation during the talks in Japan.

Answers Citizens Questions

LD1504220491

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program in Russian, in its "Vremya" newscast at 1800 GMT on 15 April, carries a 7-minute report by correspondents V.Korzin and L.Stroykov on President Gorbachev's stopover in Khabarovsk on 15 April on his way to Japan. The report begins with a clip of Gorbachev laying a wreath at a war memorial. The video then shows him approaching a group of veterans.

Gorbachev says: "I came to my village, and there is such a modest monument in the form of a concrete slab. I looked at it—my God, how many people from that small village! And here, too, (pointing at the memorial with engraved names on its sides) how many, how many lives were lost!"

A man in the group asks: "What is the situation with the union treaty?" Gorbachev replies: "The union treaty—I think this is precisely issue number one, the union treaty, since mutual relations between the republics, that is, their economic relations with one another, too, are the main thing, because here, here things are moving faster now."

Another man says: "You should pay attention to the Far East. After all, we are completely different people (giggles)." Gorbachev responds: "We regard everyone as our people. All are our people. As Lenin used to say, this town, albeit a remote one, belongs to us."

The video then cuts to another street crowd, with Gorbachev in the midst.

Gorbachev says: "I am going to Japan, you know. Everybody keeps asking how I am going and how many islands I am planning to give away." Voices in the crowd say: "Do not give away a single one!" and "And what do you feel? Will you cope?"

Gorbachev says: "I feel the same as you. I feel the same as you, I cannot have a different opinion. And I am aware of your opinion.

A man in the crowd asks: "Mikhail Sergeyevich, have you changed your views in connection with our referendum here?" Gorbachev replies: No, no! Soon we will...I will come back and on 23 April we will get together to discuss the union treaty in specific details and to sign it as soon as possible. I think nobody has the right to change the people's will. This is the main thing".

Over shots of cheering crowds, the correspondent says that the day passed in similar meetings with people on the street. Gorbachev is then shown laying flowers at a monument to Lenin in central Khabarovsk. The video then cuts to another meeting in the street. A woman asks: "It used to be said that things would become more expensive by 100 or 80 percent. But why has everything become five or six times more expensive, why is it so? What about the standard of living?

Gorbachev replies: "No, you know what? It also depends on the way things are explained in our country. On the whole, in general, prices—if one takes all the prices in the country, those for industrial and household goods, for food—they were increased 1.6 times, that is, all the prices went up so." A voice from the crowd says: "On the whole, on the whole." Gorbachev continues: "Yes, yes. Food, as a rule, doubled or trippled, other prices not as much because a television set or a car were (?expensive) even then." A woman says: "We are not talking about them, we are not (?interested in them)." Gorbachev responds: "Well, I am speaking on the whole. So, and individual kinds of industrial goods, those which, on the whole, well such as, say, everything made of flannel...Are their drivers here? They could admit, they used to take a dress (word indistinct) and wipe (the car) with it. How could that be (?tolerated), all in all?"

A women says: "Yes, that was cheap."

Gorbachev adds: "And the same situation with bread. Look what is going on on trash dumps!" The first woman exclaims: "Yes, bread! I work at a bakery, just look what is taking place!" Gorbachev responds: "It is awful what is taking place on trash dumps! There is nothing but bread there! In short, from the price rises, the state budget received only what we increased in November, from black and red caviar, emeralds and items...everything else, 85 percent of the sum received from the increase has been directed to compensation."

The video then cuts to a visit to the Japanese military cemetery where Gorbachev is shown laying flowers. The correspondent says that many people in Japan have waited years for this moment. Gorbachev, Raisa and other officials are then shown visiting a church built in memory of victims of the Stalinist repressions; the correspondent notes that "about 30,000 people were killed in the Fear Eastern Amur camp." Gorbachev and Raisa are shown laying flowers to a memorial stone. Gorbachev is then shown meeting another crowd.

A woman says: "May God give you good health and a long life! We will support you." Gorbachev responds: "I am counting on that." An indistinct exchange follows. Gorbachev then says: "Of course, these are difficult times but we must get over them so that better times may follow. And if we fail to get through to these times...after all, some people are constantly trying to start a fight, one must admit..." The woman cuts in: "No, no, we pin our hopes on you and we support you".

PRAVDA Report on Visit

PM1604151091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Special correspondent L. Pyatiletova, TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Khabarovsk"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev stopped over in Khabarovsk en route for an official visit to Japan.

It was in Khabarovsk that his tour of the Far East ended in summer 1986, when he spent seven days gaining a detailed knowledge of the life and problems of this vast region—our state's outpost on the Pacific Ocean. And now, a little over four years later, there is a new meeting on the banks of the Amur.

The president was warmly greeted by veterans on Glory Square at the memorial to the Far East servicemen who died on the battlefields of the Great Patriotic War. There are 20,000 names on the granite slab, illuminated by an eternal flame, where M.S. Gorbachev laid a wreath.

Then, as during the previous visit, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR president laid flowers at the monument to V.I. Lenin on the city's central square. The visit to these monuments is a Khabarovsk tradition. But the city also has a quiet spot where such eminent guests have not been seen. This is the Japanese cemetery. Here more than 160 Japanese prisoners of war lie buried. Thanks to the contacts established in recent years between Soviet public organizations and the Japanese association of former POW's and also thanks to the efforts of the local authorities, complete lists of the dead are being clarified and drawn up. This is the first ever visit to the cemetery by a Soviet leader; M.S. Gorbachev laid flowers there.

M.S. Gorbachev paid tribute to the memory of the victims of Stalin's repressions. A chapel paid for by people's donations was built at the site of a pit—the grave of those shot in 1937-1938—and opened on 20 October 1990. The president laid flowers by the memorial stone there.

And as always, wherever the president goes on his travels around the country, he invariably dedicates a considerable part of his time to, as it were, informal meetings with people. In Khabarovsk M.S. Gorbachev talked with those who had gathered around the sites of the monuments and chatted with city people on the streets and squares. There was a lively and sometimes even heated exchange of opinions. What was it about? About difficulties in the economy, increasing prices, the lack of social protection, the orgy of crime... People expressed profound concern at the political instability and asked whether the Union Treaty will be signed soon...

The theme of the miners' strikes cropped up. The president's opinion is that we have a law on strikes but it relates to the resolution of labor conflicts, not political ones. There was also a discussion about prices. This painful topic cropped up numerous times. It is easy to understand people's feelings. But in these dialogues on the streets you could see for yourself that the state's measures are being received with understanding. Mikhail Sergeyevich was also asked whether it is feasible for the city of Nakhodka to actually become an economic free zone. I believe, the president answered, that we should turn the whole Far East toward the countries of the Pacific in this way so as to create broad opportunities here for cooperation. We have to embark boldly on everything that brings benefit.

Then M.S. Gorbachev took part in a conference of soviet, public, and economic leaders from the kray. For over two hours the audience gave the president a frank account of what has changed in the region's life since 1986, what problems have been resolved, and what problems have, conversely, become more acute.

The general opinion was that the main result of that first visit was the adoption of a long-term state program for the comprehensive development of the production forces of the Far East Economic Region, the Buryat ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and Chita Oblast. It was later subjected to criticism a number of times, but this document had helped carry out a social revolution in the kray's development for the first time in Soviet power's existence. And while it was being fulfilled—during 1987, 1988, and the first half of 1989—the people of Khabarovsk felt its influence on literally all aspects of their lives. Speaking about this, N. Danilyuk, chairman of the kray soviet, cited the following figures: the construction of housing has increased by 40 percent, of schools by 47 percent, and of polyclinics by 32 percent. The increase in capital investments in the social sphere achieved by reducing production construction has had a particularly beneficial effect on the development of the countryside. The financial position of farms has been strengthened. Whereas, in 1986, 26 of the kray's 103 kolkhozes and sovkhozes were loss-making, by 1989 that figure was down to just one.

In the second half of 1989 and in 1990, however, in connection with the switch to economic accountability and self-financing ministries and departments first sharply reduced and then stopped the investment of resources in the kray's development. The program ceased to exist, which led to a decline in production here. The power industry, the defense complex, construction, and the agrarian sector suffered most of all. A large number of Khabarovsk people have been left with even less social protection than before.

"Were we not hasty in abandoning our long-term program?" P. Belyy, general director of the plant named for the Lenin Komsomol in Komsomolsk-na-Amure, asked the president. And he gave him this advice:.

"When you are in Japan, look at how many different state programs—regional and sectoral—they have there. We are convinced that, since the natural resources of the Far East are needed not just by Far East people alone but by the whole country, we cannot do without such an approach."

He received support in the speeches of L. Nagornyy, general director of the Far East Aviation Company; V. Kudashov, chairman of the Komsomolsk-na-Amure Soviet; and USSR People's Deputy Yu. Chichik, director of the Krasnorechenskiy Sovkhoz.

But what harm the collapse of economic ties has done to the national economy! L. Kiseleva, general director of the "Vostok" sewn goods association, and B. Korsunskiy, chairman of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast Soviet, talked about the light industry enterprises consequently left without raw materials.

But no matter how many problems and unresolved questions the Khabarovsk people have, their mood during their meeting with the president was businesslike, which you could not help but notice. In virtually every speech there were proposals on how to ensure that the Far East embarks on the path of radical renewal.

The meeting was addressed by M.S. Gorbachev.

When it was necessary to finalize the actual date of the visit to Japan, M.S. Gorbachev said, I thought that I should meet once more, albeit briefly, with the people of Khabarovsk and hear about what is happening in this enormous kray. And, speaking about Khabarovsk, it is necessary to say what is happening in the Far East at this difficult time when responsible tasks relating to the country's immediate and long-term future are being resolved.

My brief contact today with Khabarovsk residents shows that the social, economic, and political atmosphere is tense but people remain calm and still hope for a solution to this situation.

But, as was to be expected, the processes connected with the transition initially to new wholesale and purchase prices and now to retail prices, too, are perhaps the most painful of the measures relating to perestroyka in the economic sphere. We felt for a long time that a price reform was needed. It could not go on that way: The country could not live without coal, oil, gas, or metal while at the same time those who work in the basic sectors had no real profits or funds and could not resolve their social problems. Look at how this is turning out now!

Nevertheless we cannot accept the position of some of the miners, nor can we disregard the realities of the miners' life. It must be clearly said: These two elements must be present in our position. And at the recent meeting with miners they said: We understand that the government has no "quick fixes," but just create the kind of economic conditions which will enable us to produce different results ourselves and resolve our questions by working well and showing economic initiative.

We agree with that. And what the government and the miners examined recently—after that there will be an examination of the situation with workers from other basic sectors—is designed to keep these sectors stable and at the same time enable them to increase their incomes and improve living conditions on the basis of the new approaches.

The president went on to explain the need for the reform of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices, stressing that otherwise there cannot be a market, competition, or incentives for labor, nor can our financial state be improved.

We now have an economic recession: In the first quarter we lost 5 percent of industrial production and about 13 percent of agricultural production. National income has fallen by 10 percent in places. If this tendency is not halted we will move toward a situation in which there will be more money, money circulation will increase, but production will fall and thus the value of the ruble will diminish.

M.S. Gorbachev noted that the main cause of this situation is the disintegration of economic ties. We have begun to tear our all-union market apart.

The correct idea of granting a sovereignty [suverenizatsiya] in which people's aspirations for the rebirth of each people and of statehood are expressed reached the point where, first, the republics began to fight against the laws and the center, then the regions joined in—they began to fight the center and the republics—and then it degenerated to the rural soviet level. And now we have fallen into the trap whereby each individual decides that he can get out of it by using his own specific situation. One has construction materials, another machines, a third has wheat, a fourth timber, a fifth metal, and so on. Each for himself.

Yes, this is drivel, Comrades. But it showed the center that the republics were plotting against it and showed the republics that the center, by insisting on state orders, was operating on the imperial principle: Keep what you have, do not let go, and resist any redistribution of powers or delegation of rights and responsibility. This suspicion lasted several months. After many meetings and conversations representatives of the republics' Councils of Ministers headed by Comrade Doguzhiyev worked out an approach to the stabilization of economic ties this year and a concept for 1992. It is based on ties between enterprises via the contract system. We need to understand the characteristic of the present situation. We must put everything aside and pool our efforts so as to sort out production. There must be no further slump, we must increase production—and I mean not only through a strengthening of ties but also incentives. Through the land reform by encouraging initiative in the agrarian sector; and through support for medium and small business and potential for the cooperative movement to increase its strength on a healthy basis. If we give incentives to producers and introduce benefits for those who produce goods and reduce or, in some places, remove all taxes on profit so that there is a point to producing more goods, then we can begin moving.

Thus it is necessary to stop now the processes of rally mania, strikes, and stoppages in the national economy. The countdown is proceeding literally by the day and by the week: If we do not understand that, it will be too late. It is already becoming clear how events will develop after the disintegration of ties and the slump in production. People left without wages, incomes, the wherewithal to go to the market and the stores, especially with present prices, will resolve problems the familiar way. And that will not be the best method but the very danger which we simply cannot tolerate. This is the national responsibility of all state structures and political organs.

The Far East has, of course, its own characteristics. Everything that is happening in the country has a Far East coefficient in terms of the region's development specifics. There are tremendous opportunities here which will generate a different dynamic for the country's socioeconomic development. Therefore we must return to the targeted programs for the development of the Far East. And I think that this must mean new programs. The situation within the country has changed, the sources are different now, too. Previously everything was done by command, now it is on the basis of interests. Those who take part in this program will gain from it. And I think that it is necessary to involve in its elaboration—both in the sphere of consultations and discussion and in the sphere of practical implementation—foreign experts and in particular foreign capital. We must not balk at this; there is broad scope here for healthy cooperation. The Far East itself will work for the republic, the Union, the people, and the country as a whole.

This is a vast business. And when I return, we, together with the Russian leadership and science—on the large scale and at your regional level—must consider this elaborate a concept, and without delay begin working on a targeted program for the development of the Far East. During the visit to Japan I expect to discuss this theme with our Japanese neighbors.

Speaking about the topical tasks of the present day, the president stressed the need to master advanced technologies which will save energy and resources. We have now a wasteful economy, so that we must carry out conversion and develop the accumulated potential. And first of all produce what the world will buy, including military hardware.

Answering questions from comrades present and responding to their ideas, M.S. Gorbachev again expressed the view that it is now necessary to abandon all ambitions in the country and concern ourselves with saving the state. We must save the economy from collapse, restore law and order and legality in the country, and create conditions for the confident functioning of the organs of power. Without that, the talk about what needs to be done will be so much hot air.

People do not want us to be at loggerheads in this situation and, I think, we must all show restraint. And politicians and leaders of all levels must put the interests of the country and the state above all else. There can be no other approach. Nothing of a personal nature should impede the solution of the task of saving the fatherland. For this reason we have planned a meeting of the leaders of the republics on our return from the trip to Japan with the intention of discussing all this and taking action.

We cannot go on in this way. An economic agreement has been adopted and everyone has signed it, but not everyone is carrying it out. A republic adopts a law which is at variance with union law. But what is union law? It reflects the interests of all the union republics.

The war of laws must be ended and the functioning of executive power restored from top to bottom. Today rural soviets do not recognize the decisions of the republic Council of Ministers or the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee]. Can you really work like that! People who have become so muddle-headed and who are no longer capable of realizing what's what simply have to be replaced. Democracy without firm, law-based power equals general chaos.

Power structures will become bureaucratic if there is no democratic environment. We have put democratic processes in train, but they need to be balanced by stable, firm, and effective power.

Our supreme task is to sign the Union Treaty before this month is out and then proceed to its ratification in the next. We have the Union as a new federation, a sovereign state, and we have our Russian Federation as a state uniting republics. All these things can be correlated. If the Russian Federation does not renew itself, develop different dynamics, and live and operate in the new conditions, it is difficult to expect a vibrant, normal, and confident life for the Union. But in exactly the same way, if you play Russia off against the Union, processes of disintegration will set in in Russia itself—they have already started. Answers must not be sought somewhere in the clouds: They need to be sought in our 1,000-year-old history and in our current realities while introducing new elements into what we call the renewed Russian Federation and the renewed Union of Sovereign Republics.

All this is attainable juridically, politically, and actually. It has to be understood that there must be no tsarist, imperial behavior, or separatist behavior. Neither is acceptable and either will destroy our cause.

We have the mandate of the people, M.S. Gorbachev said, who voted to retain the USSR as a renewed federation of sovereign republics, where rights and freedoms are reliably safeguarded and the rights and freedom of every person regardless of nationality are protected. While some people think that it was possible to forget this when working on the referendum, since the referendum, I think, the people will not accept this. This formula makes it possible to reach optimum decisions which promise the dynamic development of the Union state and every sovereign republic in the completely new conditions which now exist. That is the task we must tackle.

Responding to an appeal for cooperation with B.N. Yeltsin, M.S. Gorbachev said: On hearing Comrade Yeltsin's concluding remarks I saw elements of a constructive invitation to cooperate there. But two or three days later, when a report was published on the press conference held 40 minutes after the concluding remarks, I could not understand: Was this the same man or not?

So I proceed on the basis of what was said to the congress. If the Russian leadership and the Supreme Soviet act likewise, that will, I think, create the basis for constructive processes to undergo development and for an end to be put to destructive processes and all confrontation. If, however, they act like Comrade Yeltsin in his concluding remarks [as published], then we should have to say bluntly: This will lead to no good. It will mean another spiral and escalation in confrontation, with all the ensuing dangers and consequences.

In the situation in which we live, when questions must be tackled without even a week's delay, we have to collaborate. I think that ultimately common sense, reason, and our common concern, anxiety, and responsibility for the fate of the state will triumph.

In conclusion the assembly wished the president and accompanying officials a successful trip to Japan, while M.S. Gorbachev wished the people of the Far East resilience of spirit and a host of good deeds.

A meeting took place the same day between the USSR president and the Far East Military District command.

M.S. Gorbachev's departure from Khabarovsk for Tokyo is planned for the morning of 16 April.

Gorbachev Begins First-Ever Visit to Tokyo

Arrives, Met by Nakayama

LD1604024991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0141 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo, 16 Apr (TASS)—USSR President M.S. Gorbachev arrived today at Tokyo's Haneda Airport from Khabarovsk and has begun his official visit to Japan. This is the first visit of the top Soviet leader in Japan in the entire history of bilateral relations.

M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva were met at the airport by Japanese Foreign Minister T. Nakayama, USSR Ambassador L.A. Chizov, and S. Edamura, Japan's ambassador in the USSR. An artillery salute of 21 salvos was fired in honor of the Soviet leader.

During his 16-19 April stay in Japan M.S. Gorbachev will meet Emperor Akikhito and hold several rounds of talks with Prime Minister T. Kaifu. The leaders of the two countries will discuss bilateral relations, including the problem of concluding a peace treaty and a wide range of international issues, linked, in particular, to East-West relations, the situation in the Near East and in the Asian-Pacific region. The USSR president is also to meet prominent political and public figures, leading figures of Japanese business, hold a news conference, and make a brief trip around the country.

It is expected that joint documents will be adopted on the results of the visit envisaging the stepping up of exchanges practically in all spheres of bilateral relations.

Minister of Foreign Affairs A.A. Bessmertnykh; USSR Minister of Culture N.N. Gubenko; B.M. Isayev, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet; K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations; A.A. Kozyrev, RSFSR minister of foreign affairs; V.P. Lukin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International issues; M.E. Nikolayev, chairman of the Yakut-Sakha Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet; V.M. Falin, CPSU Central Committee secretary, head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs; and A.N. Yakovlev, senior adviser of the USSR president, who are accompanying the head of the Soviet state during his trip, have arrived along with him.

Meets Emperor Akihito

LD1604042991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0355 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo, 16 Apr (TASS)—The Akasaka Palace in the center of Tokyo—the official residence of the USSR president for the time of his stay in the Japanese capital—today became a venue for the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and the Emperor of Japan.

After an exchange of greetings, M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva, Emperor Akihito and Empress Mitiko took their seats on the terrace of the palace. One could hear fanfares. The anthems of the Soviet Union and Japan were played. Emperor Akihito introduced his children—Crown Prince and Princess, as well as Prime Minister T. Kaifu.

The USSR president inspected the guard of honor. Then, M.S. Gorbachev and Emperor Akihito, in the same car, led a procession of cars to the Imperial Palace, where state ceremonies and receptions of foreign guests are held. The USSR president held a talk with the Japanese monarch.

Talks With Kaifu 16 Apr

LD1604151391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo, 16 Apr (TASS)—The first Soviet-Japanese summit meeting started today in Tokyo.

The first round of talks lasted around three hours. M.S. Gorbachev proposed proceeding on the basis that this was a meeting between representatives of two great peoples, two great neighbor states. Hence the particular responsibility of those taking part in it.

There was common understanding that the state of Soviet-Japanese relations reflected not only on the two countries but also on processes in Asia and the world. A desire for Soviet-Japanese relations to be of a new quality, not only at the government level but also at the level of the people, was clearly expressed. In this connection Toshiki Kaifu highly appraised the USSR president's visit to the cemetery of former Japanese POW's in Khabarovsk.

M.S. Gorbachev gave his appraisal of Soviet-Japanese relations in the context of the radical changes that have taken place in recent years, bearing in mind the halting of the "Cold War;" the new nature of Soviet-American cooperation; emergence into a new, higher phase of the European process; the real disarmament that has started; and the improvement of the USSR's relations with many states, including states in the Asia-Pacific region.

Against this background, it is evident that Soviet-Japanese relations are inadequate. They do not correspond to the opportunities that have opened up as a result of the profound transformations in the Soviet Union itself, its aspiration to build foreign economic ties in accordance with the rules generally accepted in the world, and its fundamental aim to become part of the world economy.

Against this background, the absence of a peace treaty, which would finally draw a line beneath the legacy of World War II, seems an anachronism.

The president gave an all-around justification of the logic of forming Soviet-Japanese relations of a new quality—through accumulating the potential of cooperation in all directions, through mutually advantageous solution of specific problems, and through expansion of multiform communication between people. There is a chance for Soviet-Japanese relations to move into another phase. For this, it is necessary to think in a fresh way, to meet one another half-way, and to take account of the realities and the balance of interests.

Specific attention was given to the history of Soviet-Japanese relations, which date back into the depths of the centuries. But it is the task of historians, M.S. Gorbachev commented, to sort out the details there and clear everything up. The experience of international relations over recent years, however, confirms the effectiveness of continual, frank dialogue; all-around exchanges and deepening of interaction; and, finally, creating an atmosphere in which all problems may be justly resolved and all difficulties surmounted. We are not foisting ourselves upon you as friends, the president said, but we are ready, by joint efforts, to prepare a breakthrough to a new level of relations.

An exchange of opinions took place on the nature and significance of the documents that are to be signed during the course of the visit. M.S. Gorbachev drew attention in particular to the memorandum on intergovernmental contacts, including summit-level meetings, and stressed the importance of the agreement on technical assistance to the economic reform in the USSR. Evaluating highly the memorandum on cooperation on overcoming the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident, he expressed gratitude for the contribution Japan has already made to this noble cause.

A discussion was begun on the theme of economic links, which M.S. Gorbachev described as the necessary basis of Soviet-Japanese relations as a whole.

The president invited Prime Minister Kaifu to make an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation was accepted, and it was agreed that the visit should not be put off for too long but maintain the dynamic of the dialogue successfully begun.

Taking part were A.A. Bessmertnykh, K.F. Katushev, N.N. Gubenko, B.M. Isayev, A.V. Kozyrev, A.S. Chernyayev, I.A. Rogachev, L.A. Chizhov; T. Nakayama, M. Sakamoto, H. Owada, N. Hedo, S. Yanai, M. Orita, and S. Edamura.

Ignatenko Cited on Kaifu Talks

PM1704090391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 p 3

[Correspondent N. Tsvetkov report: "President on Official Trip. Soviet Leader Steps Onto Japanese Soil for First Time"]

[Excerpt] Tokyo—[passage omitted]. In another auditorium Vitaliy Ignatenko was briefing journalists.

"A good, decent start has been made," the president's aide said. "Our interlocutors were frank in the extreme. The president expressed the hope that the sides would discuss all questions like good neighbors. Speaking about the state of Soviet-Japanese relations, M.S. Gorbachev noted that they could go on being developed as they are now—slowly and gradually. But this would not accord with both countries' prestige in the international community or with the context of relations that is taking shape in the world. The Soviet president called for a move toward a new quality in our relations. There is a basis for this.

"Both Gorbachev and Kaifu came to the conclusion that the face-to-face meeting will be useful."

Akihito Speech at Banquet

PM1704093591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed account of speech by Emperor Akihito of Japan at 16 April Tokyo dinner for USSR President M.S. Gorbachev under the general heading "Dinner in the Palace"]

[Text] I sincerely welcome Your Excellency Mr. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Mrs. Gorbacheva, who have arrived in our country on a visit. Your Excellency's visit is an epoch-making event, since it is the first official visit to Japan by the head of your state, and it is of very great significance for strengthening friendship between our countries. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to give a dinner in honor of Your Excellency and Mrs. Gorbacheva.

Your country and Japan are neighbor-countries with a long history of contacts. Ever since Japan emerged from national seclusion and became a member of the modern international community, your country has always been one of the most important countries for Japan, and ties between the two countries in many spheres, such as trade, culture, and others, have been broadened and enriched during these years.

At the same time there have also been periods between our countries attended by pain and sadness. However, I am very pleased that there is a growing desire in various circles in our countries to deepen mutual understanding and trust and to build new relations between the neighbor-countries.

I cannot fail to hope that the visit of Your Excellency—the first president of the USSR, who is directing reforms which embrace many spheres inside the country and is making a contribution in the international arena to the cause of peace and stability throughout the world—will become an historic moment for the establishment of truly stable, friendly relations between our countries.

Today mankind is continuing to make indefatigable efforts to seek ways to a peaceful society without war. In this connection I sincerely want the peoples of both countries to establish broader and more substantive relations of trust than before and together to make a contribution to the cause of peace and prosperity throughout the world, as well as in the name of the happiness of the peoples of all countries.

I have been told that, in addition to meetings with prominent government figures and representatives of various circles, the program of your stay provides for a tour of the country and offers you an opportunity to familiarize yourself with Japan's traditional culture. It is now the height of spring, an excellent time when all creatures are being filled with new vital force. I hope that Your Excellency's and Mrs. Gorbacheva's visit to Japan will be very fruitful and pleasant.

I propose a toast to the health and happiness of Your Excellency and Mrs. Gorbacheva and also to the USSR's prosperity and your people's happiness!

Gorbachev Speech at Banquet

LD1604131391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1025 GMT 16 Apr 91

["Speech by USSR President at Dinner in Emperors' Palace"—TASS Headline]

[Text] Your Majesties! Ladies and Gentlemen! On behalf of my wife and myself, personally, I heartily thank your majesties, the the Government of Japan, and the Japanese people for your hospitality and cordiality. From the very first hours of our stay in Japan we have sensed a sincere aspiration to do everything to make the first visit in history by a head of the Soviet state a landmark in the development of relations between our countries.

Our countries and peoples are neighbors. Our links go back into the depths of the centuries. Much historical evidence of the mutual attraction of the Russians and Japanese for one another has been preserved.

Compositions about Japan by our writers, travelers, and journalists from the first decades of last century up to the present are imbued with sincere respect for the Japanese and for their rich and unique culture and originality.

We value the lively interest with which your compatriots have written and are writing about Russia, since the (?Kodayu) two centuries ago.

Japanese poetry and classical prose are loved in our country. There is great interest in modern Japanese literature. We love your paintings and theater. At the same time Russian classical literature has met with profound understanding among the Japanese. You have come to like our music and invariably give hospitality to our ambasadors of art.

Spiritually we are close; however, fate has more than once tested the kind feelings of our people and we have found ourselves in situations that have for long years darkened relations between our two countries.

Paying our respects to the memory of those who perished on both sides during the wars and expressing condolences to the families of the POW's who died on foreign soil, we say: Everything must be done so that the misfortune of hostility never again befalls our peoples and states. On the threshold of a new century and millennium we must draw from the past only the things that bring us closer and mutualy enrich us.

Currently what brings us close is common values, such as respecting human rights and freedoms and aspiring to national accord and a democratic structure and to peace and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Now that we have put an end to the "Cold War," the time has come to open up more widely to each other and to work freely, hand-in- hand, building a house of trust and sincere good-neighborliness.

Our visit has only begun. There is a great deal of work ahead. We are hoping for a deepening of dialogue which would help us to understand one another and to move forward together toward this goal.

We have had the fortune to come here at cherry-blossom time. It is reminiscent of our cherry orchards in bloom, something which has long been seen as a symbol of beauty, harmony, conciliation, and happiness. We will be taking home a fine picture of Japan in a pinkish-white haze of cherry blossoms.

Permit me to wish that Heisei, or "Achieving Peace," the title so shrewdly chosen for the era of your rule, comes to pass for relations between the USSR and Japan also.

On behalf of my people, who are also renowned for hospitality, I invite Your Majesties to visit our country at a time convenient for you.

Good Health to Your Majesties and may the Japanese people prosper!

To Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness!

PRAVDA on Reaction to Visit

PM1704083191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition pp 1, 4

[PRAVDA special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and I. Latyshev report: "The Way to New Relations"]

[Text] Tokyo, 16 Apr—The impression is that the Soviet president's visit to Japan began yesterday and not today... M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the cemetery where Japanese prisoners of war [POW's] are buried generated a tremendous response here. Many people with whom we spoke today said with tears in their eyes how highly they assessed this human gesture. "The fact that President Gorbachev visited the cemetery and laid flowers on Japanese graves is not only humane, but will also provide a boost for a review of the history of the question of Japanese POW's in Siberia," ASAHI SHIMBUN comments. "Politically this step would wipe out the remaining bad memories and hostile sentiments toward the Soviet Union." At the same time the newspaper advocates that the Japanese side display readiness to revise its views of Japanese intervention in Siberia during the revolution and the Civil War in Russia.

People here consider it profoundly symbolic that, after laying a wreath on the Japanese graves, the president honored the memory of the victims of the Stalinist repressions. Everything in this world is interconnected, and to some extent this seals our common historical destiny which must never be repeated either.

The first day of the USSR president's stay on Japanese soil was extremely intensive. Official functions followed one after the other. Such is the schedule for M.S. Gorbachev's visit—a schedule adopted with both sides' consent. It must be said that, in terms of devotion to the job and capacity for work, the USSR president found the Japanese participants in the talks to be quite worthy partners.

Japanese political ceremonial envisages their chosen guests' visiting the imperial palace and talking with the man who is the "symbol of the state and the people's unity." The conversations with Emperor Akihito did not, however, presuppose discussion of any political questions. Under the current constitution, the emperor's position precludes this. Nevertheless today's meetings between the USSR president and Japan's emperor were an event of political significance.

But the first round of summit-level talks was the "highlight" of today. M.S. Gorbachev's conversations with Prime Minister T. Kaifu touched on the current state of and prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations and the problems relating to a peace treaty between our countries. It is still too early to pass judgment on the results. Although a briefing given by the president's press secretary said that a good start had been made. The participants in the talks noted the importance of Soviet-Japanese relations in the contemporary world and devoted the bulk of their time to problems of developing these relations. We think that these did not merely constitute "diplomatic" assurances, but substantial progress. It is well-known that the Japanese prime minister has been under strong pressure to take a tough stance on the territorial claims. However, it is now clear that the Japanese side realizes the significance of the Soviet leader's visit and does not want to reduce the talks to a single problem. Especially since that kind of approach would lead to deadlock.

The public can be said to be keeping a very attentive eye on this visit. We visited the headquarters of Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] and met its new secretary general, Keizo Obuchi. In response to the question of what he thinks about our president's visit, the LDP secretary general said: "The entire Japanese people attach exceptional importance to the visit. We wholeheartedly hope that there will be an opportunity to settle questions that have remained unresolved and that Japanese-Soviet relations will develop along the path of good neighborliness on the eve of the next century...

"We would very much like M.S. Gorbachev's talks with our prime minister to be successful, and the dialogue that has started up as a result of determined steps on the part of both governments to advance our relations. Without doubt, the main question at the talks will be the discussion of Japanese-Soviet relations, but at the same time, since the Soviet Union is a great power and Japan is also a great economic power, global problems like ensuring peace on our planet, environmental pollution, and so on will also be discussed. As for bilateral relations, the Japanese people would indisputably like—on the eve of the 21st century—to resolve the territorial problem and conclude a peace treaty ensuring the stability of our relations."

Even today, the LDP secretary general went on, although there is no peace treaty as yet, ties are developing rapidly between the Soviet Union and northern regions of our country, prefectures along the shores of the Sea of Japan. We hitherto thought of the Soviet Union as a remote country in terms of distance and time, but today it has become far closer to us.

In conclusion of our conversation K. Obuchi said: "As a great world power, your country is still a major political force. We wish it economic stabilization. We want to develop our bilateral relations together. I would like your newspaper PRAVDA to provide extensive coverage of Japanese reality. This would help to deepen mutual understanding between our two countries."

That is a good idea. It is to be hoped that a step toward mutual understanding has already been taken during the first day of M.S. Gorbachev's stay on Japanese territory. At any rate, this evening ended on a touching human note. The two countries' leaders attended a children's gala concert. Japanese, Soviet, and U.S. children sang songs about peace and about soldiers who failed to return from the battlefields and were transformed into white cranes...

Japanese Reportage on Visit

WA1604204491

For Japanese reportage on the 16-19 April visit to Japan by Mikhail Gorbachev, including reports on the activities of the Ignatenko-led advance team, see the Japan section of the 12 April of the East Asia DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

ROK Envoy Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit

LD1304012191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 12 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 12 Apr (TASS)—Kong No-myong, the ambassador of the Republic of Korea in the USSR, stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent that the forthcoming meeting between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, and Republic of Korea President No Tae-u will serve the development of mutual understanding between the two leaders as well as between the people's of the two countries.

As is known, after concluding the official visit to Japan Mikhail Gorbachev is planning to make a short stop on the South Korean island of Cheju where he will meet with the president of Korea. This will be the third personal meeting of the presidents of the two countries in the last ten months.

Though the agenda has not been made up, said Kong No-myong, it is presumed that Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u will discuss issues of bilateral relations, the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, including the situation in the Korean penninsula, and exchange views on topical issues of world politics.

The ambassador expressed the idea that the question of the desire of South Korea to join the UN will also be touched upon during the meeting. He expressed, in connection with this, the hope that the "USSR would support the innermost desire of his country to become a full-fledged member of the world community".

As regards to the problem of the Korean penninsula, the ambassador noted, that "not one year or two will be enough" to resolve it—"this is a thing for the distant future". The seriousness of the issues, from his point of view, is conditioned by the fact that the north and the south of Korea have "systems that are too different", that there are "too many contradictions" between them. According to Kong No-myong, it is first necessary to do away with the tension between the two parts of Korea in order to overcome the existing mutual distrust. The coming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u will play its positive contribution, he thinks, in easing the tension.

North Korea Expected To Resume North-South Talks

SK1304040491 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 10 Apr 91

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] ROK Prime Minister No Chae-pong sent a letter to DPRK Premier Yon Hyong-muk proposing that the talks between the premiers of the North and the South, which has been suspended since last year, be resumed.

The goal of the talks between the premiers of the North and the South is to ease tension on the Korean Peninsula and to achieve North-South cooperation in political, economic, and cultural fields.

In connection with this, station reporter Sergey Petrov writes:

The talks between the premiers of the North and the South lasted from September last year until last December. During this period, the North and the South held three rounds of talks, and sought to narrow the differences in their views.

For example, at the second and third rounds of the talks, the ROK and the DPRK put forward very similar proposals in principle. If a nonaggression treaty was concluded, the threats existing between the North and the South would be eliminated.

Another round of talks was expected to be held in February 1991. Pyongyang protested against the ROK-U.S. joint military exercise—Team Spirit-91—and decided to suspend contacts between the governments.

Washington and Seoul anticipated that the DPRK would make such a decision, and therefore in advance they notified the DPRK that the period of the Team Spirit exercise would be shortened and the scale of the exercise would be cut by 30 percent. In addition, a foreign inspection team, including the DPRK, was invited to observe the Team Spirit exercise.

However, this effort did not change the North Korean side's traditional view toward the military exercise. The DPRK has regarded the military exercise as an act against it.

The past two months, however, have not been days of futility. The sides realized the formation of a single North-South table tennis team to participate in the World Table Tennis Championships to be held in Japan.

The ROK Red Cross had sent to the DPRK Red Cross Society a letter proposing that talks on the issue of separated families be resumed.

Consistently included in No Chae-pong's letter is the spirit that the talks between the premiers of the North and the South should not be delayed or suspended. Given this fact, we see that Seoul is making efforts for cooperation, reconciliation, and reunification. I expect Pyongyang to reply to the letter sooner or later, because such a dialogue entirely conforms to the relations of interest between the North and the South.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Singapore's Goh Criticized on U.S. Bases View

HK1604044991 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Singapore Prime Minister Goh Chok-tong, during his visit to Manila, declared that the presence of American troops in the Philippines is needed to ensure the peace and stability of the region. All in all, what he has said is nothing new, because the Singapore Government has long held this position. In the past, Singapore's position was understandable because of the military confrontation between East and West which affected the Asia-Pacific region.

However, today times have changed especially with the setting up of a new order, particularly in the region. But there are still some leaders in the region still infected by the cold war syndrome and who behave in the traditional way when they talk about military matters to ensure security and stability. Such attitudes are counter to current events and prospects.

But are there still those who believe that a threat exists from the Soviet Union and call for the retention of the American military presence in Asia? Does this type of leader still exist in Singapore? Prime Minister's Goh's mouthing of the Pentagon line on the matter of the Soviet threat states that this threat still exists.

What is the main reason that he urges the retention of the American presence in the region? One of the reasons is that he believes there will be a vacuum if the American troops leave, and other forces like India and China will enter the scene.

Is there any proof for this allegation? Beijing and New Delhi have clearly stated that they have no intention of setting up any sort of military structure outside their territories. Therefore, this belief is without basis.

On the part of the Soviet Union, its forces—particularly in Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam—are steadily being reduced. Moscow is convinced that genuine security can be achieved by means of disarmament and cooperation. Hence, in the Asian part of the USSR, 200,000 Soviet soldiers have gone home, including 120,000 who have already left the Far East.

Concessions From Cambodian Resistance Urged

BK1404091591 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 12 Apr 91

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas expressed optimism that a comprehensive solution to the Cambodian problem would be achieved in the near future. Speaking at a briefing in Jakarta, he said a new meeting of Cambodian parties within the framework of the Supreme National Council [SNC], would presumably take place in May in the Indonesian capital. Our observer Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev writes the following:

Evidently, a solution to the Cambodian problem is again imbued with optimism following the recent deterioration of the situation in Cambodia due to provocative actions by the opposing Cambodian side. The parties now in conflict are trying to agree at the negotiating table. According to Ali Alatas, at the forthcoming meeting the Cambodian SNC will primarily focus on the search for mutual concessions by Cambodian parties on implementing the UN peace plan for Cambodia. Will there be an agreement as expected? Judging from the Indonesian foreign minister's statement, there is still a chance of this.

However, even Indonesian diplomacy—which has done a great deal to solve the Cambodian problem—will not be able to solve Cambodian affairs on behalf of the Cambodian parties themselves. What matters is whether the representatives of Phnom Penh and the opposing Cambodian side will carry anything with them to the SNC meeting. The statement made a few days ago by Comrade Hor Namhong, foreign minister of the State of Cambodia, in my view, reflects Phnom Penh's constructive stance. Comrade Hor Namhong again specified that he will not reject the UN plan. In his view, at the forthcoming meeting, the SNC should agree on what functions the group—as the symbol of Cambodia's sovereignty—should hand over to the United Nations and what kind of preparations should be made to organize general elections in Cambodia. In other words, Phnom Penh proposes that the internal aspect of settling the conflict be seriously discussed and solved. The other side should also be ready to make concessions. Intransigent stances will only spoil things.

Our observer Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev concludes: In my view, real optimism over the prospect of solving the Cambodian problem also stems from recent negotiations and direct meetings among representatives of a number of countries involved in this issue, for example the recent visit by the Soviet foreign minister to China during which the Soviet side, along with the Chinese side, pledged to play an active role in solving the Cambodian problem; the efforts of Japanese diplomats aimed at realizing the UN plan; and finally, the consultative talks a few (?days) ago between the U.S. and Vietnamese sides and between the U.S. and Cambodian sides around the search for peace in Cambodia.

It should be noted the United States has just announced the end of its aid to groups on the opposing Cambodian side. The issue of ending military aid to Cambodia was also discussed at the talks held by Comrade Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in Beijing and at the talks a few days ago in Bangkok with Comrade Qi Huaiyuan, deputy foreign minister of the PRC.

Moscow Views Bangkok's Indochina Policy

BK1704111991 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1300 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] Thai-Lao relations were quite tense three years ago. Both countries were engaged in border disputes, some of which had led to armed clashes. The turning point came in late November 1988 when the then Prime Minister General Chatchai Chunhawan visited Laos. After that, relations between Thailand and Laos began to develop and strengthen.

The present provisional Thai Government, set up by the military junta after its power takeover in February 1991, has indicated that it would continue with the previous government's policy toward Laos. This is apparent in the coming visit of the Lao foreign minister next week.

The provisional Thai Government has made an impressive [words indistinct] when it reached an agreement with Laos on the withdrawal of troops from the common border. Recently, both sides withdrew its troops from the border under the supervision of a joint commission. A source of bilateral tension has therefore been eliminated.

On another note, Thai Foreign Minister Asa Sarasin has told THE NATION that the Thai Government has set up an economic aid program for neighboring countries, most of which will go to Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia.

The continuation of the current Thai leadership's policy can be seen from its attitude towards Vietnam. On 19 April Vietnamese Deputy Foreign Minister Le Mai will visit Bangkok to prepare for an exchange of visits at the prime ministerial level. The Thai leadership has shown its intention of continuing to develop good-neighborly relations with Vietnam. This is apparent in General Sunthon Khongsomphong's instruction to ban activities by Vietnamese refugees and to disarm them.

But there are ambiguities regarding the attitude of the Thai leadership towards the Cambodian problem. Thailand has, on the one hand, pledged to extend economic aid to the Phnom Penh government and has given assurances of its adherence to the principle that a settlement must be found for the Cambodian problem politically. On the other, it has said it would not play an active role in this issue.

Near East & South Asia

Pavlov, Shamir Discuss Bilateral Ties in London

LD1704100291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0830 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Aleksandr Malikov in London on meeting between USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir]

[Text] It is the first time since 1967, when diplomatic relations were broken between Israel and us, that there has been a meeting at such a high level. The prospects for a Near East settlement and relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv were two subjects dominating the conversation between the two prime ministers. These two questions are actually closely interconnected and interlinked. The Soviet Union has been making energetic efforts for a long time to unblock what is one of the oldest regional conflicts.

The USSR, like the Arab world and the whole international community, continues to be concerned by the inflexible position of Tel Aviv which, along with giving some signs of apparent flexibility, continues to create settlements on other people's land which it occupies, as it did during the Persian Gulf war. It is clear that until such time as the Israeli occupation machine goes into reverse it is hard to expect a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict that is acceptable to all sides, just as it is hard to expect a full restoration of our diplomatic relations with Israel.

Yitzhak Shamir for his part is persistently proposing a renewal of these relations, but on a completely different basis: in exchange for Israel's agreement to the convening of an international conference on the Near East where the United States and Soviet Union would be joint chairmen. The Israeli prime minister repeated these conditions when speaking to journalists after his meeting:

It is absolutely necessary, the Israeli prime minister said, that for a meeting on the Near East to be held with participation of the USSR and United States, the Soviet Union should establish normal diplomatic relations with Israel.

The Israeli prime minister described his London meeting with Valentin Pavlov as friendly and constructive, noting that there are positive signs for the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries. It is obvious, however, now the practical implementation of these positive signs and a move from quality to quantity depends on Israel more than on anyone else.

Najibullah Sends Messages to Gorbachev, Bush

LD1504152191 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 15 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Shishkov]

[Text] Kabul April 15 TASS—President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan on Sunday sent messages to President Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union and President George Bush in connection with the third anniversary of the signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan.

Afghanistan reaffirms its commitment to its present foreign policy based on the U.N. Charter, full observance of the provisions of the Geneva accords, friendship and mutual cooperation with all countries, particularly neighbouring ones, including Pakistan, Najibullah's message to the U.S. President says in particular.

However, Pakistan openly violates the Geneva accords, international law and universally recognised norms and principles, which manifests itself in growing aggression against the sovereignty of Afghanistan, the message states.

Najibullah requested Bush to put pressure on Pakistan to bring about an end to intrigues against Afghanistan, to cease attacks on Afghan cities and make it observe the Geneva accords.

The Republic of Afghanistan as a party to the Geneva accords, and the Soviet Union as a guarantor of them, fully abide by the obligation they took upon themselves in Geneva. Unfortunately, Pakistan, evading the fulfillment of its obligations, is stepping up a military aggression against the Republic of Afghanistan, says Najibullah's message to Gorbachev.

The aggression is being carried out at a time when the Afghan leadership has come up with a realistic plan to normalise relations with Pakistan. Through its actions Pakistan not only questions the prestige of the United Nations and of the guarantors of the Geneva accords but also complicates the situation in the region, the message states.

Najibullah requested the Soviet president to use his international prestige to bring about an end to aggression against Afghanistan and to promote a peaceful political solution to the Afghan issue.

Moscow Protests Pakistani 'Interference'

LD1604164691 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The Soviet Foreign Ministry has deplored the growing Pakistani interference in Afghan affairs. A statement for the third anniversary of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan says the seizure of the city of Khowst by the extremists supported by groups that patronize the irreconcilable opposition is an example of interference.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry has called for joint moves, probably through convening an international conference, to help the Afghans launch a dialogue with the participation of all conflicting sides.

TASS Reports Isayev Views on Mideast Solutions

LD1604203791 Moscow TASS in English 2006 GMT 16 Apr 91

[by TASS correspondent Igor Vinogradskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The idea of a regional conference devoted to the Arab-Israeli conflict is non-productive at present, Vladimir Isayev, a leading specialist of the Soviet Institute of Oriental Studies told TASS.

Isayev was commenting on the situation in the Middle East after U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's visit to the region. During his trip and talks in Turkey, Israel and Egypt Baker discussed the possibility of convening a regional peace conference to settle the crisis between Israel and Arab countries.

Isayev stressed that none of the parties to the conflict was ready for "mutually acceptable compromise solutions. The Palestine Liberation Organisation has lost authority with Syria and Egypt, major participants in the conflict. Most Palestinians on occupied territories support the Palestine Liberation Organisation while Israel categorically refuses to talk with that organisation. Discussions may last for weeks without making any actual headway," Isayev said.

The Middle East problem should be approached with the same plan which was used in Europe during German unification: a step-by-step, gradual movement, Isayev explained. As for the peace conference, it must become the final touch in the settlement.

"For instance, it is possible to begin with the Gaza Strip, involving Egypt, Israel, the Soviet Union and the United States in talks. The Golan Heights may come next, involving Syria. Next the problem of the Lebanese security belt could be tackled. And finally, the West Bank and Jerusalem should be addressed."

Primakov Receives Iranian Ambassador in Moscow

LD1504125891 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 15 TASS—Member of the Soviet Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov today received Iranian Ambassador to the USSR Nematollah Izadi at his request.

They discussed a wide range of issues relating to Soviet-Iranian political and economic relations, as well as the situation in the Gulf region and in the Near and Middle East as a whole.

East Europe

Walesa Cited on Troop Withdrawal, Gorbachev

LD1504092391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Item from roundup of IZVESTOYA, TASS, REUTER, UPI reports: "Interview with Lech Walesa"]

[Text] While on a visit to France, Polish President L. Walesa made the following statement in an interview with the newspaper LA CROIX L'EVENEMENT on the subject of Soviet troops stationed in Poland: Apart from a statement on the need for Soviet troops to be present in our land, Mazowiecki's government has done nothing about this question. I reproach the government for this, maintaining that there is a need to bring the date for troop withdrawals forward. Right now we are trying to speed up this process, but we do not want to expel or humiliate them. We are attempting to show that keeping the troops does not bode well from either a political or an economic viewpoint. Once we have done this, it will simply remain to find solutions to the technical questions of withdrawal.

Question: How do you see the Soviet president's future?

Answer: Gorbachev is a unique personality. He has done a lot. But it is singularly difficult to govern such a country, such a power, as the Soviet Union at the present time. It is harder than anybody could imagine. What happens next is a matter for USSR domestic policy. I have always admired Gorbachev, but I do not know what the future holds. Yeltsin is also a personality, but he was never USSR president and thus has never had to prove himself in this post. And whatever you may say, Gorbachev is proving his capabilities now.

Talks on Troop Withdrawal From Poland Viewed

LD1604223591 Moscow International Service in Polish 1600 GMT 16 Apr 91

[(Vasiliy Lisovik) commentary]

[Text] The sixth round of talks between the Soviet Union and the Polish Republic on the transit of Soviet troops evacuated from Germany and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland has taken place in Warsaw. Radio Moscow commentary (Vasiliy Lisovik) writes in this regard: Above all, it is worth stressing that the Warsaw round of talks was preceded by an important event, namely, the withdrawal ceremony on 9 April of a Soviet missile brigade at the Borne-Sulinowo garrison in Koszalin province, in an atmosphere of great pomp. In the presence of representatives of the Polish authorities and military leadership, part of the weaponry and some of the personnel left for home. The official planned withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland, on the basis of an initiative from the Land of the Soviets and in agreement with the Polish side, began in this way.

In two days, the sixth round of talks on the timetable for troop withdrawal and the settlement of accounts is taking place in Warsaw. It transpires from the results that the forementioned sixth round will not be the last. This in itself is testimony to the two sides' divergent approaches to this problem, and so, quite simply, divergence in relation to a number of important points. The most important are the deadline for withdrawal and the mutual settling of accounts as regards transporting troops to the Soviet Union, as well as the purchase by the Polish side of various Soviet assets, mainly buildings occupied by the Army and by officers' families.

The Polish side demands that the last Soviet soldier leave Poland before the end of 1991. The Soviet side believes that this is an unrealistic date, and has put forward its own timetable, ending withdrawal before the end of 1994. This relates to previous rounds of talks. A similar situation also arose during the sixth round, although, on the basis of my own observations as well as on the basis of interviews with the plenipotentiary representatives of the Soviet and Polish Governments on the subject of these talks, I can state that some progress has emerged toward achieving compromise, writes (Vasiliy Lesovik). I think that the most realistic date for the final, agreed dealine should be the end of 1993. This does not mean, however, that this deadline has been agreed. As the Radio Moscow commentator stresses, this date concerns a possible compromise.

The mechanism for the transfer of housing estates and buildings remains a complex problem. According to the Radio Moscow commentator, neither side has, up to now, proposed realistic means for cutting this Gordian knot. Therefore, another round of talks is indispensible, this time in Moscow. Will it be the last? Will all the i's finally be dotted regarding the timetable for withdrawing Soviet troops from Poland during the announced official meeting between the presidents of both countries? In reply to this question, my Polish journalist colleagues often refer to a view which, they maintain, was expressed by Lech Walesa when he stated that two Nobel prizewinners were capable of finding a common language in respect of all problems, writes (Vasiliy Lesovik), ending his reflections on the sixth round of talks on the transit and withdrawal of Soviet troops from Central and East European states.

Commander on 'Secret Nuclear Garrisons' in Poland

LD1504225191 Warsaw PAP in English 2208 GMT 15 Apr 91

[By PAP correspondent Zdzislaw Raczynski]

[Text] Moscow, April 15—Speaking to the MOSKOVSKIE NOVOSTI weekly commander of the Soviet troops stationed in Poland General Viktor Dubinin said it would be best for the interest of Poland not to raise at all the question of Soviet secret nuclear garrisons in Poland. Dubynin said the Polish press made a sensation of the issue while all the installations had been known to the Polish Defence Ministry, were built by Polish construction workers according to Polish blueprints, and then leased to the Soviet Army in Poland for storing, as he puts it, "products" for the Polish Army.

Yanayev Receives Polish Senate Leader

LD1604225191 Warsaw PAP in English 2204 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 16—Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev received here today Speaker of the Polish Senate Andrzej Stelmachowski, TASS has reported.

The two discussed international affairs as well as Polish-Soviet bilateral relations.

Documents on Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Signed

PM1504152991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Borovkov report: "Signing of Documents"]

[Text] Soviet and Hungarian representatives signed documents relating to questions of the Soviet troops' withdrawal from Hungarian territory. These documents lay down the procedure for the reception and transfer of installations and the means of assessing environmental damage. Lieutenant General V. Shilov and Lieutenant General A. Annus, the two governments' plenipotentiary representatives on questions of the troops' withdrawal, took part in signing the documents.

West Europe

Supreme Soviet Chairman Departs for France

LD1704110791 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS—USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov has left Moscow for Paris today at the invitation of Laurent Fabius, president of France's National Assembly.

Lukyanov is expected to meet President Francois Mitterrand today. He also plans to meet French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas.

The Soviet guest will be received at the National Assembly of France.

Tourists Without Visas Refused Entry to Rome

PM1504142791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 First Edition p 5

[S. Startsev and A. Tarakanov report: "Strike on Board the Fedor Shalyapin: We Want Ashore!"]

[Text] "I admit that I've never had the occasion to see such a thing in all my 17 years working in the passenger fleet," Viktor Chernishov, captain of the motor ship Fedor Shalyapin said as he bid us farewell on the gangplank, TASS correspondents report from Italy.

...It all began last Sunday [7 April], when the Soviet liner with 650 tourists from Georgia, Lithuania, the Ukraine, and Estonia on board, tied up at its moorage in the port of Civita Vecchia near Rome. When their documents were officially registered, it transpired that none of the tourists had entry visas for Italy. A detail of policemen was immediately posted by the gangplank, and our fellow countrymen were effectively put "under arrest." An excursion to the "Eternal City"—for which the majority of the tourists had set off on this journey, having paid a pretty penny for their places in rubles and foreign currency—was disrupted. The threat of a real mutiny on the ship arose. The passengers elected a "strike committee," which adopted a decision to conduct a hunger strike as a warning. The tourists demanded that the program of the cruise be executed exactly as advertised.

We witnessed this critical situation when we first came on board the Fedor Shalyapin 8 April. The ship was in the grips of the kind of passions you might see at a rally, and it was only the restraint of the captain and his crew that allowed the situation to be kept under control. The Soviet Embassy in Italy and consulate staffers intervened in the affair. Having expended enormous efforts, they succeeded in securing the visas, which the cruise organizer—the "Odessaturist" Association—did not manage to supply. In the end, the people did nevertheless go ashore and even spent one day in Rome. However, the cruise was actually cut short, as the tourists were due to stay in the Italian capital three days.

Supreme Soviet

Committee's Conclusion on Miners' Demands

PM1604121991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Conclusion by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Industry and Energy and the Soviet of the Union Commission on Labor and Social Policy "On the Fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Resolutions on the Implementation of the Miners' Socioeconomic Demands"]

[Text] In accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet 21 March resolution "On the Miners' Strike," the Committee on Industry and Energy and the Commission on Labor and Social Policy, in conjunction with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, have analyzed and prepared a conclusion on the fulfillment of the USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on the implementation of the miners' socioeconomic demands.

We are publishing the full text.

Having heard the report by USSR Deputy Prime Minister Comrade L.D. Ryabev and the deputies' working group comprising V.V. Bushuyev, V.P. Lushnikov, O.I. Markov, V.N. Matyukha, A.V. Grib, and Ya.A. Donchak on the fulfillment of the USSR government resolutions on the implementation of the miners' socioeconomic demands, the committee and commission note that, as of 1 April, 32 of the 37 points in USSR Council of Ministers resolution No. 608 of 3 August 1989 had been implemented.

Questions of preferential pensions for working people in the main coal industry occupations and increased leave have been resolved. Extra payments have been introduced for moving from pit to pit and for working in the evening and at night.

Regional pay weighting has been increased for USSR Coal Industry Ministry working people in Kemerovo and Karaganda Oblasts, the cities of Vorkuta and Inta, and the settlement of Khalmer-Yu. This will cost 146 million rubles [R] per year.

Total expenditure channeled directly into improving miners' living standards, taking into account increased expenditure on social security, was R565 million in 1989, R1.3 billion in 1990, and in the 13th Five-Year Plan, taking into account increased investments in the social sphere, extra annual expenditure will exceed R3 billion.

Programs for socioeconomic development in 1991-1995 for miners' cities and settlements in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], Kazakh SSR, Kemerovo Oblast, the Pechora coalfield, and Rostov, Sakhalin, and Dnepropetrovsk Oblasts have been elaborated with the participation of labor collectives, and government decisions have been adopted on them.

In the aforementioned regions capital investments in nonproduction construction is to increase by 80 percent on average by the 12th Five-Year Plan. Housing commissioning is to increase by 50 percent.

The structure of the management of sector enterprises has been simplified and a number of concerns, associations, and leased enterprises have been established.

Coal enterprises have been authorized to sell coal and processed coal products produced in excess of state orders and contractual commitments at commercial (contract) prices in the country and for export. In 1990, sector enterprises sold 6.3 million tonnes of coal for export via barter transactions.

In the plan for 1991 the wholesale price of one tonne of coal has increased by 60 percent compared with 1990. The USSR Coal Industry Ministry has been given a subsidy of R23.5 billion out of the state budget.

Despite the adopted measures, some of the targets in the resolution have not been fully met.

Questions of providing sector enterprises with very important types of equipment are not being tackled satisfactorily.

The centralized quotas allocated by the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan], the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply [Gossnab], and ministries and departments for very important types of material and technical resources are considerably lower than the 1990 level and meet only 35 to 50 percent of needs, while the level of conclusion of contracts for the supply of products required by the sector currently stands at only 80 percent.

In amplification of USSR Council of Ministers resolution No. 608, the government adopted resolutions on the socioeconomic development of individual coal regions (Donbass, Kuzbass, Pechora coalfield, and others). In the light of the decisions by the USSR Supreme Soviet and republics on the delimitation of powers and tax policy, the center of gravity in the implementation of the miners' demands has shifted to the provinces.

Local soviets, however, are not meeting commitments on the transfer of housing to sector enterprises in accordance with the volumes of capital investments transferred by them on the basis of shared participation. In 1989-1990 alone the local soviets' debt to the sector's enterprises increased by 538,000 square meters of housing and stood at 742,000 square meters on 1 January 1991. In 1990 construction organizations in the Ukrainian SSR failed to supply the miners with 290,000 square meters of housing, while organizations in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] failed to supply 100,000 square meters.

The USSR Gosplan and the USSR Gossnab are failing to solve questions of the provision of materials and equipment for construction and installation work worth R522 million.

The government decisions do not reflect topical questions of scientific and technical progress in the coal industry, the introduction of new equipment, the reconstruction of the mine stock, the improvement of working conditions, the long-term development of the sector, and the full provision of food and consumer goods for working people.

In accordance with the aforesaid, and taking into account the opinions expressed by representatives of the coal industry workers' trade union and the conclusion of the deputies' working group, the committee and commission consider that:

1. The tasks set by the USSR Council of Ministers 3 August 1989 resolution No. 608 have been by and large implemented, and the state of implementation of the decisions of the USSR government and labor collectives is not the main reason for the current miners' strikes caused by an acute deterioration of the situation in the coal regions, as in the country as a whole, and the consequent appearance of new economic and political demands by the minders.

2. As a result of talks between the USSR government and representatives of the labor collectives of coal industry enterprises in Moscow on 2-3 April 1991, agreements were reached on the miners' basic socioeconomic demands.

The normalization of the situation in the country was not helped by the fact that the examination of the miners' demands by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the talks were delayed until a month after the start of the strikes.

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet's examination of the draft laws "On Indexation of the Population's Incomes" and "On Leave Entitlement" must be accelerated.

4. To ensure the legal regulation of the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes, it is necessary to make amendments to existing USSR and republican legislative acts and to adopt appropriate new ones regulating relations between labor collectives, enterprise management, and state organs of power as well as increasing the sides' responsibility for contravening legislation and agreements that have been reached.

5. The USSR Government and the All-Union Trade Union Confederation, in conjunction with labor collectives' representatives, must conclude within an agreed period a pay agreement for the coal industry and mining engineering for 1992 and also extend the practice of concluding such agreements to other basic sectors of industry.

6. Cutbacks in sectoral science cannot be permitted. It would lead to a decline in the sector's technical standards and a resultant reduction in safety and an acute deterioration in working conditions.

7. Commissions and committees are to intensify monitoring of the implementation of the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Miners' Strikes."

[Signed] V. Kurtashin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Industry and Energy, and N. Gritsenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission on Labor and Social Policy.

IZVESTIYA Reports 15 Apr Proceedings

PM1704090191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by IZVESTIYA legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev from the Kremlin: "Law on Railroad Transportation Discussed"]

[Text] Opening the morning joint sitting of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet 15 April, Chairman A. Lukyanov proposed that the session participants immediately get down to discussing the draft law on railroad transportation at the second reading. But Deputy V. Desyatov asked to speak at this point. He suggested, in view of the situation within the country, that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in conjunction with representatives of the republics' supreme soviet presidiums, discuss questions of adopting the Union Treaty and form a Supreme Soviet deputies' group to meet with similar deputies' groups within the republics' parliaments. In his opinion, these steps will make it possible to bring forward the date for signing the Union Treaty.

A. Lukyanov informed deputies that it was planned to discuss this proposal that very day at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting.

Deputy L. Sukhov then took the floor on a point of order. He backed Deputy Kryshkin's previous proposal that the country's current problems be examined at joint sittings during the first reading. Voters say that we do not touch on these questions but that is of course not right. There is simply little information about this. L. Sukhov suggested taking specific steps at the end of these sittings to resolve these problems.

The deputy then said that he had found out about his colleagues' improper role in the newly created fund for mothers of large families. I heard no rebuttals and consequently, L. Sukhov concluded, that is the true situation. There are also other questions. For example, meat is disappearing in some areas and the Union parliament is failing to react. We are, as it were, aloof from the country's life and our people.

Taking the "opportunity afforded by the microphone," Deputy L. Sukhov said, he asked for his speech on 8 September (evidently, L. Sukhov slipped up and was referring to this month) to be televised and published in the press, because, and we quote: "IZVESTIYA presents everything as if I were virtually a schizophrenic taking up the socialist way of life and that is how I appear to my voters." L. Sukhov said that they are indignant at this.

The chairman commented that the session was considering the question of when to discuss topical problems. It was decided to deal with the current situation at the end of evening sittings so as not to thwart the course of the planned discussions.

But Deputy L. Sukhov was not satisfied by this explanation and pressed for a vote on his proposal. Only 60 colleagues backed him. A. Lukyanov asked L. Sukhov to hand over the text of his speech and, the chairman said, there will obviously be an attempt to publish it not only in the official stenographic record but also in IZVESTIYA.

Deputy V. Kirillov reacted sharply to this proposal. He said that L. Sukhov's speech of 8 April contained slander, including slander against him personally. I do not think it possible for IZVESTIYA to carry this slander, V. Kirillov stressed. A. Lukyanov instructed I. Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, to fully investigate this question.

After this controversial limbering-up, the session participants immediately embarked on their lawmaking work. V. Tsyganov, deputy chairman of the Committee on Transport, Communications, and Information Science Questions, delivered a report on the changes made to the draft law on railroad transport that was examined at first reading last October.

The aforementioned legal act lays down the economic, legal, and organizational foundations of the activity of general-use railroad transport, as well as its position and role in the country's national economy

After Deputy V. Tsyganov had answered numerous questions from his colleagues, an article-by-article discussion of the draft law began.

Moscow TV Details 16 Apr Proceedings

LD1604212491

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1857 GMT on 16 April carries a 20-minute "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program of recorded excerpts of the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow.

The announcer begins: "On 16 April the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed the state of the country's national economy. First Deputy Prime Minister Doguzhiyev delivered a report in which he said the following:

"Our country has not known a more complicated and dangerous situation since the time of the Great Patriotic War. Several factors have led to a deep crisis in the economy, the result of which is a sharp decline in the population's standard of living. The decline in production this year has affected all sectors of the national economy. The gross national product in the first quarter of this year fell by 12 percent, which is a reduction three times bigger than during the same period last year. The decline in production in the fundamental branches of industry has, for the first time in many years, led to a drop in production in light industry and agriculture. The state purchase of livestock, poultry, and eggs has fallen by 14 percent and milk by 12 percent. As a result of this, the industrial production of meat, milk produce, butter, and baby food has fallen in every Union republic. Retail trade has witnessed a decline in goods of 2.9 billion rubles [R] this year.

"The inability to control supplies and the artificial and illegal banning of production deliveries outside regional boundaries have led to a situation in which goods delivered to consumers under contract have declined R7 billion in just three months. Not all necessary measures were taken to fulfill the economic agreements between the USSR and the Union republics for the stabilization of the country's social and economic situation. The war of laws continues in the area of budget policy. The republics are sabotaging the creation of an all-Union fund for the stabilization of the economy. All this threatens the financing of the national economy, maintenance of the Armed Forces, and the fulfillment of the most important all-Union programs on Chernobyl and Aral. The situation now developing is critical in terms of setting up this social support fund needed to pay compensation in connection with retail price hikes.

"The strikes are making the situation in the national economy worse. Today most of the economic demands of the strikers, including the miners, are being met, or else mutually acceptable decisions are being made on the subject of these demands. Nevertheless, the strikers constantly insist that putting forward political demands is essential. Such political games place a heavy burden on the working people in all areas of industry, first and foremost hurting the low-income sector of the population. The grain intended for Armenia and Azerbaijan and the aluminum intended for industry have not been unloaded because of the dockers' strike in Georgia. More than 100 train loads with various goods including food for the Transcaucasian republics were stranded on the railways. The trains had to be rerouted and the transportation of the cargo through Georgia was temporarily stopped.

"The Cabinet of Ministers, noted Doguzhiyev, does not consider the situation as desperate. First of all, consolidation of every constructive force within society is needed. Mutual support, discipline, strict adherence to the laws, and discontinuation of the strikes are all necessary in the situation that has developed. Only through the joint efforts of the Union bodies, the republics, and the working collectives will it be possible to clear all the rubble on the way out of the crisis. There is no alternative.

"The government has undertaken a number of extraordinary measures—measures first and foremost connected with carrying out spring field work and the locating of additional resources for the production of food and consumer goods. Other measures aimed at getting the national economy out of this extremely complicated situation have been suggested by the Cabinet of Ministers in their anti-crisis program, which is now being studied in the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

The announcer then says that the morning session discussed the draft law on amendments and addenda to the USSR law on the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes and conflicts. Finalizaing of this draft law by the committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be carried out jointly with the Cabinet of Ministers and representatives of the trade unions.

The announcer then reads a report on the evening session, which returned to the discussion of the draft law on general principles of the USSR's youth policy. Previously the law had been adopted but without the fourth section, which deals with the foundations for the legal status of youth organizations. Today there was no special debate, the announcer says. Nevertheless, the matter of the youth age qualification did give rise to some disagreement and a recording begins.

Laptev is shown in the chair. He says that the Committee for Legislation and Law and Order proposes returning to Article 3, Part 2, which deals with the matter of age "around which we had a very long dispute," and proposes to restore the upper age limits for young people, and to set them in the 14-30 years of age range.

An unidentified deputy supports the proposal to raise the ceiling to 30. Other deputies favor either 25 or 30.

At 1908 GMT Deputy Kalashnikov appeals to Lukyanov to intervene as a qualified lawyer; he refers to the economic needs of young people under 30, and favors a ceiling of 30. Argument on the point continues.

At 1914 GMT Lukyanov is given the floor by Laptev. He points out that if the 25-year-old limit is adopted, numerous Union acts will have to be changed. The recording then ends.

The announcer goes on to say that polemics on this matter were very sharp. A vote was taken five items. As a result, a ceiling of up to 30 years was adopted unless provided for differently in the legislation of the republics. A decision on putting the law into effect was also adopted. This is the first time that such a law has been adopted in the USSR.

The announcer continues: "The Supreme Soviet proposed to the legislative commission of the Russian Federation and other similar structures of the Union republics to discuss without delay the question of strikes and ways of ending them. The Supreme Soviet calls on the Union republics to direct their plenipotenitary representatives to urgently examine this question." The deputies also raised the question of the need to discuss a draft bill on the indexation of workers' incomes in connection with the rise in retail prices.

The announcer concludes by saying that tomorrow the two chambers will meet separately and the program ends.

Political & Social

Ivashko Interviewed on Upcoming CPSU Plenum

PM1704100791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by S. Karkhanin; date and place not given: "'Understanding One Another'"]

[Text] [Karkhanin] Vladimir Antonovich, it has already been reported that a CPSU Central Committee plenum will be held 24 April to examine questions on the situation in the country and the party. Which of them, in your view, could be the priority issue?

[Ivashko] I personally am convinced that it is necessary to accelerate the processes of economic recovery. That is clear. As for cadre changes, they must proceed logically and calmly. Replacing cadres for its own sake will change nothing. Only actions can overcome the situation.

There is an illusion that we must adopt some economic model, the U.S. or South Korean, and apply it to ourselves. That is not going to happen. Because we are neither Koreans nor Americans. Policy must be formed in real conditions, not in conditions dreamed up in silent offices. In general, there must be resolute actions in the most difficult area—the economic sphere. Although this does not mean that the political reforms must end.

You often hear it said that our economic transformations lag behind the political ones. I disagree. The term unity of politics and economics is no mere quotation. This is a truth which was not thought up by Lenin but derives from an analysis of sociohistorical processes in various countries, including Russia.

The priorities must be determined. I am content that, at the state level, a turn toward the needs of the agrarian complex is being made. Without such a turn calamity awaits us. But we are essentially "fleecing" the countryside today, too. This policy has been going on since time immemorial. Thus, unless we change our approach from negative to positive, we shall undermine the basis which holds us together in society.

[Karkhanin] It is often said that party committees found themselves alienated from economic problems. Is it possible that this will be discussed at the plenum, too?

[Ivashko] There is some point in returning to economic policy but not to the question of management. Previously there really were two organs of management: The ministry and the oblast committee ruled the plant. No one needed that. It is a different matter that the party without its socioeconomic policy is not needed by anyone either.

Having renounced the functions of management, we unfortunately renounced that policy, too, even though these are completely different things. Managing means deciding how many steer a stockman needs or when to drive them to the meat combine. Policy, however, means ensuring an increase in livestock numbers in the collective or individual sector and on subsidiary plots. And if the party committee defends the opportunity of personal plot owners to have forage or pasture, this policy is attractive to the peasant who sees that the party is defending his interests. As for how many steer to keep or where to sell them, he can sort that out himself...

Returning to the question of the content of the discussion at the plenum, I would note that, if the plenum agrees, we would like to analyze the work of Communists in soviets.

[Karkhanin] Virtually every plenum is preceded by a discussion on the particular problems to be thoroughly resolved. However, the list is often repeated...

[Ivashko] Yes, that is true. This is because we talk far more than we read or do. The authors of articles in particular newspapers and magazines clearly have no idea of the subject that they have set about assessing. Furthermore, I disagree with the current formula that our country is by and large one of amateurs. Take Mendeleyev, Sechenov, Vavilov, Korolev, Landau... I was closely acquainted with a cyberneticist who was far ahead of his time in his scientific ideas. Such names cannot be ignored.

Competence is a difficult problem. I recall a director of a large plant who then became chairman of a Regional Economic Council and subsequently secretary of a party oblast committee. As a director he was magnificent, as leader of the Regional Economic Council he was very strong, but as secretary I would say he was no good at all... Incidentally, it is said that similar things happen with the Americans but they do not make a song and dance about it. If a man is promoted to a higher post and does not prove up to it, he goes back to his former post: This means that that post is his limit. And this should happen without fuss or undue distress.

[Karkhanin] In connection with the idea of a roundtable meeting, put forward recently at the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies, people have appeared who are demanding that this idea be implemented unconditionally. Is such a categorical tone justified, in your view?

[Ivashko] If there are points of contact which ultimately help the country to "scale the heights," they must be used. But attempts to formulate the choice in terms of "roundtable or nothing!" remind me of the well known episode from "The Golden Calf" where Balaganov and Panikovskiy were dividing up the money... We live in a big country and it cannot be treated that way.

Many "transient" figures surface at crucial moments. They push a rock down the mountainside without realizing that this could cause an avalanche. Regional sovereignties are clear evidence of that. I am an unconditional supporter of the sovereignty of the peoples but it must be exercised strictly within the framework of constitutional norms.

The method of destruction will not benefit its supporters: Sooner or later history will put everything in its proper place. Admittedly, in the pursuit of short-term success this method is already used often now. Someone makes a "firm" statement and becomes the hero of the press, including abroad. But you have to see what the results of this might be—that is the point.

[Karkhanin] The CPSU is now establishing cooperation with many parties, particularly abroad. Such openness is new at the moment, what is its purpose?

[Ivashko] Yes, we are now establishing contacts not only with Communist but also with Social Democratic and other parties. Two weeks ago, for example, I had two meetings with the general secretary of the Japanese Liberal Democratic Party. We do not want to impose our world outlook on our interlocutors. But if there are features in their policy and ours which coincide, and which benefit people in both countries, why not make use of them? By talking we will understand one another better. I would add that, if we find agreement in the international arena, can we really not do the same within the Union?

People often ask if we are planning to meet with the leaders of the new parties recently created in our country. Indeed, why not? True, there are among them some people who would be happy if Communists were hanging from the nearest tree, such people are hard to understand... But I am not talking about them. In my opinion, one can and must talk with the others.

The propaganda of the cult of the mind and labor has been poorly instituted among us, some polemicists have slipped toward the morals of the communal kitchen, and they are very unproductive. I often recall the ancient proverb of the wise man who thought that anyone who insulted someone else was not a very intelligent man himself... And we cannot do without a cult of the mind and of labor, "scaling the heights" of renewal demands that.

Gorbachev Aide Interviewed on Upcoming Plenum

PM1704095891 Milan L'UNITA in Italian
14 Apr 91 p 13

[Interview with Gorbachev Adviser Georgiy Shakhnazarov by Sergio Sergi in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—Is the CPSU attacking Gorbachev? Even Georgiy Shakhnazarov, one of the Soviet president's advisers, confirmed the climate of "accusations" surrounding the forthcoming Central Committee meeting. "Anything could happen" in a session which will be held against the background of the "war" with Yeltsin. It was Shakhnazarov who, a few days ago, hinted at some readiness by the Kremlin to reach agreement with the opposition. What is the present position?

[Shakhnazarov] A coalition is formed between parties, but we do not yet have real parties in the USSR. I spoke of a joint program. If there is readiness on the part of the "radicals" and "conservatives," the center will be willing to join.

[Sergi] Will it be a "roundtable" like those in Eastern Europe?

[Shakhnazarov] We saw how they ended, with the Communists pushed to one side. That would be extremely dangerous for the USSR which is a nuclear power. We say that it is possible to cooperate in the legislature, what significance to give to the "roundtable" will be discussed later. If anybody contemplates sitting around a table with the aim of stifling the others, then we do not want that. That would not be a "roundtable" but a boxing ring.

[Sergi] Yes. But after what has happened is it possible for Gorbachev and Yeltsin to sit down and discuss what needs to be done, even though it is in the legislature and not in the government?

[Shakhnazarov] There is no conflict at all between Russia and the USSR. What we are witnessing is not a struggle between one republic and the Union but between the supporters of "Democratic Russia" who control the Russian legislature and the central leadership.

[Sergi] Can Gorbachev and Yeltsin sit down together at the same table?

[Shakhnazarov] Not only should they do that but they must cooperate because I see that as the country's only hope of salvation. However, it is not certain that this will happen. Yeltsin, addressing the Congress of Russian Deputies, said he was prepared to join in a "roundtable" but a few minutes later, in a news conference, he reiterated that the fight should go on. That is a path which leads to civil war.

[Sergi] What did Gorbachev say to you about the possibility of a meeting with the opposition?

[Shakhnazarov] We discussed it in person and he reaffirmed to me that he was ready for that. But is the other side acting in the same way? It is proposing a "roundtable" but at the same time it is urging the miners not to end the strike. Yeltsin himself said that it would just take a personal appeal from him to end the strike but he has not made that appeal although he knows that with every passing day the country risks going back decades.

[Sergi] What influence does this complex situation have on international relations?

[Shakhnazarov] We tell our foreign partners that they must not count on the USSR's disintegration. If there is a disaster, it will be universal. However, we feel that many are counting on Yeltsin, saying that he stands for progress, democracy, and so forth. It must be said that Gorbachev is promoting the policy of democracy, and the transition to a market, but he does not want the situation to deteriorate, he wants it to remain controllable. His opponents, on the other hand, are behaving like Bolsheviks, they are aiming for power, they are prepared to hand the country over to anybody, the important thing is that they should achieve power.

[Sergi] Is the CPSU exerting pressure on Gorbachev?

[Shakhnazarov] Even inside the party there is a dissident faction—a conservative faction. I am not one of those who condemns all the criticism. Many people warn that there is a threat hanging over the country but the method which the democratic extremists and the extremists in the CPSU want to adopt leads to disintegration. However, we must unite to steer the country out of the crisis.

[Sergi] What might happen at the "plenum?"

[Shakhnazarov] The party as a whole is not against Gorbachev but there is undoubtedly an antiperestroyka current. There will be a battle which will be of decisive significance for the party's future: Either it will decisively adopt the path of a human and democratic socialism or there will be a danger of a split.

[Sergi] Perhaps partly because the last congress did not solve all the problems....

[Shakhnazarov] The paradox is that, theoretically, the problem was solved. If you look at all the decisions adopted, you will notice that it is the program of a democratic and socialist party. And all the documents were approved at Gorbachev's initiative. Everybody said they agreed, but there is a considerable section under conservative influence which is unwilling to accept these ideas.

[Sergi] Do you think that there will be an open clash?

[Shakhnazarov] There is as yet no sign of that, but in view of the tense situation in the country, anything could happen, and we cannot rule out the possibility that somebody might stand up and call for organizational changes in the party.

[Sergi] Do you mean Gorbachev's removal?

[Shakhnazarov] Anything might be proposed—resignations, a no confidence vote.

Leningrad Obkom Proposes Agenda for Plenum

PM1604153791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

["Appeal from the Leningrad Oblast CPSU Committee Plenum to the CPSU Central Committee and the Country's Party Organizations"]

[Text] Comrades! We, members of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee], appeal to you, moved as we are by feelings of responsibility for the fate of the state.

The need for the process called perestroyka has objectively become urgent. The inevitability of democratic changes and the liberation of public and party life from the grave heritage of totalitarianism was and remains obvious for us, just as it does for the absolute majority of honest Communists. But it must be noted with regret that, in the seventh year of perestroyka, all the words about crisis and looming catastrophe have already been said, and the gloomy forecasts are becoming a reality. If the processes that are under way are not stopped, the complete collapse of the economy will come about in the very near future, with the severest consequences for Soviet people.

Nor can we allow the further destruction of the values that the Soviet people have suffered for, and which they have defended with their blood, with the lives of millions of their nearest and dearest: The fatherland's might, honor, and dignity.

We believe that the determining cause of what is happening is the serious miscalculations in the running of the country and the policy that has been implemented in the party's name in recent times, a policy that is dangerous for the state. It is a policy that covers up the vagueness of the aims of social development, a policy of presidential powers demanded but not used, a policy turning the country into a second class power with which the world will soon cease to reckon.

The party, not aware of the specific positions of the Central Committee, has become virtually alienated from the process of elaboration of the leadership's socioeconomic course and has become hostage to the leadership's many badly thought-out and inconsistent actions. The alienation of the party masses from participation in the elaboration of political decisions has led to the perestroyka course, which engendered great social tasks, finding itself in the power of forces trying to give it a directly opposite sense: Not the renewal of socialism, but its annihilation, not the strengthening of people's power but the constitutional legalization of the dominion of private capital.

We dissociate ourselves from this course, which is leading to unjustified price rises and the deterioration of the people's life, with no prospects for its improvement.

We consider the correct political course to be one aimed at uniting the working people to struggle for the free development of all members of society, and not one aimed at the enrichment of an elite.

We believe that responsibility for the fate of the fatherland makes it incumbent upon USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, a Communist, to adopt immediate measures to save the country from economic and political chaos. Otherwise the question of the party's political confidence in him will arise.

In connection with the points set out above, we consider it necessary to hold a party Central Committee plenum in early May with the following agenda:

1. On the adoption of an anticrisis program.
2. On a draft CPSU Program.
3. On the convocation of an emergency CPSU congress to adopt the party Program.

We call for civic unity in the country. The CPSU must offer society acceptable principles for this unity as soon as possible, principles for creating a coalition of all forces united in a common aim—saving the fatherland and not allowing the slightest threat of civil war.

There must be no delay!

Gorbachev Should Resign 'At Least' One Post

PM1604152791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by observer Leonid Nikitinskiy under the rubric "History of Our Time:" "How Many Rubicons on Gorbachev's Path?"]

[Text] It is far more pleasant to say and write good things about people. Precisely about people, their individual characters and eccentricities, weaknesses and impulses, because politicians were also people once upon a time and occasionally recall this. But a politician is not a cyclist in the leader's yellow jersey, not a hammer thrower, so it is boring to sing his praises when he is a winner, when he is on the pedestal of power and this pedestal is not tottering. At the summit of his career it is appropriate to abuse him—that is what he, as the man with the power, is there for. Anyhow, there will always be people who want to sing hosannas.

There is a repellent principle that "winners escape judgment," which takes into another dimension that most false of all mankind's false ideas that "the end justifies the means." Who should be judged if not winners? And how are they to be judged if not from the viewpoint of the means whereby victory was achieved? Conversely, you should hold out a hand to the vanquished. That is right, as I see it. But it is up to him whether he accepts or rejects it.

Today behind the scenes in big-league politics there is persistent talk that the CPSU (the party apparatus, at the very least) is prepared to "surrender" its general secretary. Sometimes this emerges in either accidental or deliberate slips of the tongue, but the entire logic of the political struggle is driving at this.

Since the democrats, headed by Yeltsin, have now effectively broken through in Russia despite everything and Gorbachev has not fulfilled his mission, has not been able to contain them, the party oligarchy objectively does not need him and he should be dumped like dead wood, along with all the promises he has made. The planned "exchange of queens" has not succeeded, but the party apparatus is clearly contemplating a new gambit whereby Gorbachev could be sacrificed in exchange if not for a gain, then at least for time, which is so badly needed for recovery after the latest knockdown at the Russian Congress of People's Deputies.

Not only has Gorbachev's rating fallen catastrophically so that today it does not increase the CPSU's popularity, the paradox is that this leader who has moved to the right in the democrats' view remains too left-wing, too democratic, legal, and humane so far as the party oligarchy is concerned. He still remains an advocate of a constitutional system and rule-of-law state. But the party oligarchy no longer has any chance along this path, it is hard for it to swim with its hands tied.

On the other hand, the democrats and Yeltsin, who has received a vote of confidence, strengthened powers, and the very real prospect of becoming the first Russian president in a couple of months, are no longer needed by Gorbachev as a whipping boy. With regard to Yeltsin he has also played his historic role by stepping on the same rake seven times and helping his rival to score all the points it was conceivable to accumulate in opposition.

The perpetual quest for compromise has brought Gorbachev to the point where today he is tragically not needed by anyone—a redundant piece on a board on which a stubborn struggle between two main political forces is continuing. And the unthinkable has happened: The fiercest conservatives and neo-Stalinists have joined with the most radical democrats in wishing to get rid of Gorbachev as swiftly as possible. He is a stone in the road. But whereas he is preventing some from moving forward, he is preventing others from moving backward, and this has to be understood.

It is now possible to forecast a sharp split in party circles over the figure of Gorbachev. In fact it has already begun: Just the other day the Tyumen CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee] demanded his resignation. I think that in this situation Communists who care more about the fate of the homeland than about their own fate (I know that not all of them have yet left the party) must support Gorbachev and preserve him as a figure capable of holding back the frenzied pressure from the extreme right-wingers whom history itself is pushing onto an adventurist path. He still has sufficient prestige within the CPSU for this. By voting in favor of Gorbachev, Communists will today be dissociating themselves from the extreme right-wing forces that have emerged from their ranks.

A much more complex question is whether the antiparty-minded democrats headed by Yeltsin should and can hold out a hand to Gorbachev. There is no question that the steps he has taken in recent months, especially in the Baltic republics, can only be anathematized from the democratic standpoint. But I call on the democrats to make an effort of spirit and to rise above the carnage of the current political struggle and look at Gorbachev, as it were, through the eyes of our future descendants in order to grasp his role in the country's history.

I cannot agree with my colleague who has just published the article "Such Different Aprils...", which claims that right from the start Gorbachev only posed as a democrat and all the transformations he launched had the sole aim of strengthening his personal power. Perhaps objectively his path can be interpreted in that fashion, but subjectively my vision of Gorbachev's personality is different. So far as I am concerned he is a humanist first, and a Communist second—unlike some of his party colleagues who are Communists first and only then humanists, with an eye to the way the political wind is blowing.

In this unhappy enslaved country, inheriting Brezhnev's Politburo lock, stock, and barrel, complete with its main commandment "After us the deluge," Gorbachev immediately showed himself to be a man of conscience. There was still enough patience among the people and oil in the wells for his time as general secretary, the country could have rotted for a long time yet, decaying from within and imperceptibly sliding onto the wayside of the "Third World," and this would have had little impact on the serene comfort of the nomenklatura elite. What prompted him to cut the branch on which he himself was sitting? I can only ascribe Gorbachev's step toward freedom to the promptings of conscience.

He released the spirit of freedom from the cage whose door, in absolute totalitarian jail conditions, at that time could be opened only by a movement from outside. The walls still appeared strong, but it was all the more surprising to see the speed with which they collapsed, breeding inevitable chaos all the while, for, along with the spirit of creative freedom, its twin brother had also been amnestied: the spirit of anarchy and mob rule, of nondiscrimination between good and evil. Unfortunately, there is no freedom without evil, since mankind is intellectually and morally uneducated, especially here and now, after decades of pseudo-Marxist deception, of ruthless destruction of all that is most intelligent and moral, and of unbridled Sharikovism [sharikovshchina].

Exploiting this spirit of "destructive forces" for their own propaganda purposes and drawing attention to the pictures of collapse which really exist, the forces of reaction rapidly recovered and went onto the offensive against the spirit of freedom. There was a moment, and not just one, when it could still have been driven back into the half-destroyed cage: Remember, for instance, the painful pause of spring 1988, when it seemed that the newspapers had entirely ceased publication, so mute did they suddenly become after Nina Andreyeva's famous article. But Gorbachev resolutely crossed that Rubicon, from which it would have been possible to retreat with minimal losses in party ranks. But the next one already loomed beyond it, and there are clearly limits to a person's ability to endure the collapse of his former ideals one after another...

At some point Gorbachev was unable to break out of his own limitations, as life was demanding that he do, and he is continuing to cling stubbornly to the "socialist choice," although, like everybody else, he cannot explain why this choice is so good (if it has already come to pass) or what it is like in general (if it has yet to come to pass). Clearly, the crisis came at the moment last fall when it became clear that the concepts of the "market" and "socialism" (at least as we traditionally understand them) are in fact incompatible.

The subsequent convulsive, often absurd steps, beginning with the torpedoing of the "500 days" program without declaration of war and ending with the recent hysteria at the Federation Council—all these are merely consequences of the main crisis. Gorbachev has tragically lost his way and, blindered by those same "principles," has literally confused right with left. He looked back in perplexity to Staraya Square [site of CPSU Central Committee building] and, like Lot's wife in the legend, who glanced back at the city of Sodom, doomed to destruction for its sins "for great was the outcry against its people before the Lord," was turned into a pillar of salt. Democracy had overtaken its former leader, bypassed him on all sides, and he, having aged somewhat, was left behind...

But it is stupid and unseemly to scream that Gorbachev is a fascist and that his arms are covered in blood up to the elbow. Yes, he has assumed responsibility for the blood shed in Tbilisi, Baku, and Vilnius since he has not called to account the direct culprits behind these crimes and has sheltered the real individuals who inveigled him into these adventures. But, as I see it, he too was horrified at what was done and the day after the attack on the Vilnius television center did not give orders for an assault on the Lithuanian legislature, in which there would have been not rivers but seas of blood. He could have done so as head of state, and some people had certainly already written such a scenario for his role, but he could not do so as a human being.

Because as a human being he is ultimately humane, despite everything. And it is by virtue of this fact that today he does not suit extreme right-wing circles, which require a very different figure for their purposes. And if they are intending to bring down Gorbachev as an obstacle to unleashing a full program of terror (for only terror can restore power to the party oligarchy, although not for long, just until it is defeated in the subsequent civil war), are the democrats really going to help them with their own hands by hitting a man when he is down?

That is the practical aspect of the problem, but there is also a moral aspect. Yes, Gorbachev did indeed deceive and abandon the left-wingers, but now he may be basely betrayed by the right-wingers. They will drown him before our very eyes. They will try to make him the scapegoat for all the sins which they themselves inveigled him into so they can come up smelling of roses. That is an old ploy, and this cannot be allowed to happen.

In the resulting situation, in my view, the democrats, headed by Yeltsin, must once again hold out a hand to Gorbachev and help him to get back on his feet. God grant them the strength to drag him after them. Not only because he is still valuable as an individual, but also because decent people do not leave the wounded on the battlefield. This is not the time to settle scores with the person who opened the way for life. You cannot finish him off, conscience rebels against this.

There is a fine memorial to Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev in Novodevichye cemetery. The sharp, stunning contrast between slate-black and snow-white marble recreates the image of a man who did not recognize shades of gray in his policy. The monument to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will certainly be different. The range of colors will be much wider and more finely gradated, and the whole essence of his contradictory image will certainly have to be reflected in a complex interplay of half-tones.

I wholeheartedly wish Mikhail Sergeyevich a long life, but I would not like him to be recalled with warmth only 25 years on, like Khrushchev. Has he done everything he could for the country? Not yet, I think. He still has a chance of becoming the first leader of the country in the 20th century who is not only not forgotten but not cursed by later generations. But to achieve this, I think, he must state today, even if only by way of preliminary notification, that he is resigning from at least one of his two posts.

It is strange to see as the USSR president the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee when a negative attitude toward the party is perhaps the main unifying element of the motley democratic forces that are gradually squeezing the CPSU out of state structures. A statement that he was leaving the CPSU (which certainly does not necessitate a renunciation of the Communist world outlook, maybe actually the reverse today) would enable Gorbachev to consolidate his position in the presidency and to retain it quite normally until the scheduled election of the USSR president by direct universal suffrage in accordance with the Constitution.

On the other hand, he may remain as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announcing his resignation from the post of president and remaining an extremely influential political figure. In this case the resignation should follow together with the vice president, so that the job of head of state is immediately filled by a leader directly elected by the people. Until he is elected the post of president must not remain vacant for even a moment—otherwise the Army, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], and the KGB, where the influence of conservative forces is still strong, may take a hand, with the result that somebody leaps into that post regardless of any elections and democratic procedures.

That is how I see the normal course of political events. However, we have no guarantee against an abnormal course: If Gorbachev rejects the hand extended to him by the democrats and retains both posts, condemning himself to be the hostage of the right-wingers. This would be fraught with catastrophic consequences, for you cannot endlessly test the people's patience and rely solely on the fact that they are not putting up any resistance.

May I be forgiven for the perhaps unduly personal tone of the remark, but I experience the drama of Gorbachev as the drama of our history and therefore as my own drama too. I do not want us to remain apathetic spectators in it, still less spectators who are maliciously rubbing their hands.

Perhaps I am wrong in my assessment of the political situation, even very severely wrong. Only coolheaded historians 100 years after the event are not wrong, unless, of course, they want to be. This remark is dictated chiefly not by political but primarily by moral motives. It is simply sickening to see how they are hitting a man when he is down, revolting to see human ingratitude. When you brandish a portrait of Gorbachev emblazoned with a swastika at a rally, just remember where you and that placard would be if he had not opened the door of the cage.

Moscow Journalists Union Expels Kravchenko

PM1604115391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 p 1

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Have You Heard? Have You Read?"]

[Text] By decision of the Moscow Journalists Union Secretariat, L.P. Kravchenko, chairman of the State Television and Radio Company, has been expelled from the Journalists Union "for instances of the virtual introduction of censorship in television."

Union To Investigate Expulsion

LD1604062191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2050 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] The USSR Union of Journalists has set up a special commission to finally elucidate all of the circumstances connected with the expulsion of Leonid Kravchenko from the union. The results of this commission's work will be reported at a congress of the country's Union of Journalists scheduled for the end of April.

Radio Rossii on Visit by Dissident Bukovskiy

LD1604213991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2030 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] You know, perhaps, that Vladimir Bukovskiy, a former Soviet citizen and a human rights activist, arrived in Moscow on Monday. In an interview with a Russian News Agency correspondent, he said that he still believes that Communists cannot be removed from power by legislative methods because Bolshevism per se is based not on a legislative system but on an administrative one.

The main purpose of Bukovskiy's visit is to set up a fund [as heard] of democratic opposition which, after an organizational period, will engage in the struggle for power in the country.

Bukovskiy thinks democratic forces are currently disunited and poorly organized and, because of this fact, incapable of real action. He also believes that democrats have been deliberately exposed to a difficult task: They have been given responsibility but no executive power.

Bukovskiy is sure confrontation is unavoidable. Neither Gorbachev, the KGB, nor the CPSU will voluntarily leave the political arena. A general strike is the only solution for the country. Bukovskiy believes everybody must rise and tell the communists to go away. Otherwise, Bukovskiy contends, violence and hunger will ensue.

Vladimir Bukovskiy plans to meet with Boris Yeltsin and other Russian leaders, along with members of democratic political movements and representatives of the striking miners. Responding to one journalist's question about how he would start a live television speech—if such a speech were to take place—Bukovskiy answered: With a call for a general strike, and I would end it with the same.

General Kalugin Discusses KGB Activities

AU1604132291 Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 11 Apr 91 p 3

[Telephone interview with Soviet General Oleg Kalugin in Moscow by correspondent Szerdahelyi; date not given: "What Is There in the Hungarian KGB Dossier?"]

[Text] Oleg Kalugin is more than calm. He has never felt safer, as he unveils one Soviet State Security Committee affair after the other. As he says: Publicity is power, and the authorities are not crazy enough to eliminate a man who is perfectly well acquainted with the KGB's methods.

This is why Kalugin was pleased to speak to our correspondent on the telephone. Incidentally, Kalugin is currently being tried in court.

[Szerdahelyi] You recently caused a commotion with the so-called Bulgarian affair. However, you do not have any evidence. So, where does your great courage come from?

[Kalugin] Yes, we are talking about the murder of dissident writer Georgi Markov, an affair that the Bulgarian press tried to gloss over in 1978. Initially, they even tried to deny the actual murder. It is a fact that Sofia and Todor Zhivkov asked for the KGB's help in preparing this action; in other words, Moscow did not propose the plan. Incidentally, one of the two KGB officials involved is no longer alive today.

[Szerdahelyi] Does this mean that the other KGB official could be questioned as a witness?

[Kalugin] Of course not. However, I do not wish to make any further comments on that subject at this stage.

[Szerdahelyi] In other words, you have no evidence whatsoever?

[Kalugin] I cannot supply any documents or signed papers, and the papers proving the sojourn in Sofia were carefully destroyed. Nevertheless, I am still prepared to appear in court at any time in relation to this case. However, I do not think his will actually happen.

[Szerdahelyi] Why are you so self-confident?

[Kalugin] It may well be that a silent KGB official is a good KGB official, but you can find out more and more about the activities—both abroad and at home—of the organization. That is why, these days, it is difficult to spectacularly get rid of people who unveil things.

[Szerdahelyi] Perhaps you could tell us something about the Hungarian connection?

[Kalugin] I have to tell you perfectly honestly that I have not dealt with the Hungarian dossier, although I knew at the time that the KGB did not direct the Hungarian connection out of pure friendship.

[Szerdahelyi] I hope you are not saying that these relations continue to exist today?

[Kalugin] All KGB offices in former socialist countries have officially been closed down. However, that does not signify a retreat. Even you must be aware of that; you cannot be that naive!

[Szerdahelyi] Please excuse my last question: Have you not been called a traitor?

[Kalugin] Yes, I have; several times, and by several people. I still believe our only way of getting even with the past is by honestly settling our outstanding bills. You do understand, do you not?

Shenin, Ivashko View CPSU Registration

91UN1296A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 13 Apr 91 p 1

[Article by Viktor Ukolov: "The CPSU Has Been Registered"]

[Text] *The Communists did not challenge others to a race and did not elbow their way through. However, when their turn came, they registered the CPSU without fanfare but with all due respect for the procedure, the way it ought to be. A certificate of registration of the CPSU Statute was issued at the USSR Ministry of Justice in the evening hours of the day before yesterday to a representative delegation of the party headed by Deputy General Secretary V. Ivashko. Incidentally, the CPSU is the first of the political parties to be given an official status.*

It would appear that a formal act occurred which is even far removed from the urgent needs of the country. In congratulating "those responsible for the celebration," Minister of Justice S.G. Lushchikov emphasized the true significance of this act: The codification of sociopolitical and socioeconomic transformations is under way in our state which is associated with the actual exercise of human rights and freedoms recognized by the international community in our country. Mutual relations between the state and public associations are becoming stable; therefore, the citizens feel more confident.

Indeed, it is so. Let us recall recent rallies. There was a great deal of spontaneity in them! Malice was artificially fueled, and passions were stoked. Some of the people do not have strong nerves. At a time like this, being convinced that the authorities will take all measures bringing about the triumph of the law and, if need be, its defense does stand for something.

However, this is a digression. V. Ivashko spoke in response in an auditorium on the fifth floor. He said that they interpreted the act of CPSU registration as a manifestation of the processes of renewal and democratization of society progressing, albeit with difficulty.

Tukhtakhon Kirgizbayeva, the leader of a cotton-growing brigade from Malik State Farm in Uzbekistan, was among the members of the CPSU delegation. She has 26 years of party tenure. We talked to her when the ceremony was over.

"I am firmly convinced that the CPSU is the main cementing force in our society and country. This is why the ranks of the party on our state farm keep growing. Quite recently, we had 160 Communists, and now we have 200. The best people join, the honest and hard-working ones. You can see them right away. After all, planting is under way, and every minute counts. Rallies are the farthest thing from our minds. We want the cotton crop to be good in order to clothe the people."

How does Central Committee Secretary Oleg Shenin, who was also present at the registration, view today's event?

He said: "The CPSU is not an abstract notion, after all. I am a CPSU member, you are, and she is... All of us together make up the party, and this is why the registration of its Statute affects everyone. It binds all of us to act within the framework of the Constitution and the laws of the Soviet Union."

Undoubtedly, the official processing of the Communist Party by the state organs has many aspects. It is no accident that CPSU Central Committee secretaries had to answer a great many questions at a press conference which was held on the same night in the hotel Oktyabrskaya.

In particular, V. Ivashko said that, since we live in the Soviet Union where the USSR Constitution applies which is the same for all, all CPSU members are covered by the state act of registration today, and there is no need to be covered by it again within the republic communist parties. As far as the parties themselves are concerned, they are free to choose, in keeping with the decisions of the 28th party congress.

Question by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA:

To what degree is participation in the strike movement compatible with being a member of the CPSU?

Vladimir Antonovich said: "This is an exceptionally complex issue. Proceeding from the interests of the people, as they say, there is nothing good about strikes but bad things. This is why a Communist should oppose this form of struggle to the last. However, on the other hand, a communist is within a workers community. How can he abandon his comrades?"

The day that will go down in history, whatever view we take of it, ended on this note.

Gorbachev Aide Dzasokhov Profiled

91UN1246A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 10, 10-17 Mar 91 p 7

[Article by Vladimir Orlov: "I Didn't Choose; I Was Chosen..."]

[Text] "He began his career as First Secretary..."

The above is a quote from the official biography of Aleksandr Dzasokhov, 56, one of Gorbachev's main aides, who prefers to keep out of the limelight, confining himself to run-of-the-mill pronouncements at rare interviews and frequent conferences.

Like Gorbachev, he has divided his activities between the state (he is Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee on International Affairs) and the party (a Politburo Member and Secretary of the Central Committee). Like the President, Dzasokhov began his career in the Northern Caucasus: Gorbachev, in his native Stavropol; Dzasokhov in the neighbouring North Ossetia's capital and his native city Vladikavkaz (then Ordzhonikidze).

Aleksandr Dzasokhov's biography is a model of nomenklatura promotion. A graduate of the Mining and Metallurgy Institute, he was sent to supervise a City Komsomol Committee, thus giving up a teaching career. "At that time I didn't choose. I was chosen," he said 34 years later. After a year in North Ossetia, he was promoted to the YCL [Komsomol] Central Committee in Moscow and appointed Executive Secretary of the USSR Youth Organizations Committee. The new post gave him ample opportunities to travel. Having visited Cuba and Algeria, he returned to Moscow and was promoted to the Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee at the same time Gennady Yanayev came to the Youth Organizations Committee.

Incidentally, on both committees Dzasokhov served as First Vice-Chairman.

In 1973, without abandoning the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity, the mining engineer by education became a Cand. of Science in History after defending a dissertation on "The Development Processes in Newly Independent States" at the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee.

In 1986 the specialist in independent development was dispatched to Syria as the Soviet Ambassador, and two years later Dzasokhov the diplomat became First Secretary of North Ossetia's Regional CPSU Committee. In Ossetia he was elected people's deputy of the USSR and was soon using his international experience as Chairman of the parliamentarian Committee on International Affairs.

At the 28th CPSU Congress Aleksandr Dzasokhov received the posts of a Politburo Member and the Central Committee Secretary. From then on he has been trying to "accumulate international experience in the party's political activities," with ideology becoming his new sphere. One of his first efforts, as summed up by himself, was "the discussion of...political activities by the party committees to help harvest the crops and organize the newspaper and journal subscription campaign...and to defend historic, revolutionary—specifically Lenin's—heritage."

Speaking at the Central Lenin Museum in Moscow, the new party ideologist said that "when the younger generation is being forcefully severed from Lenin," it is necessary to prepare with double care for wide-range celebrations of the leader's anniversary of birth.

Apart from defending Lenin's heritage, Aleksandr Dzasokhov has publicly spoken up to defend the Soviet army and culture. Thus, he has rendered his support to the idea of a "double-barrelled structure of ideological bodies in the army," entrusting them with political and party functions. In his opinion, such a structure "will make it possible to considerably raise the qualitative level of ideological education...and to bring party committees closer to the men and officers..."

While planning to defend the army by reinforcing the party's bonds with the officers, he is seeking to defend public morals by stepping up the struggle against video salons which "promote violence, cruelty and undisguised pornography." "The party...will support measures designed to protect public morals," the Central Committee Secretary has promised.

Advisory Group Drafts Anti-Crisis Program

91UN1283A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Mar 91 pp 1-4

["Program document": "Averting Catastrophe, Ensuring the Development of Society"]

[Text] At the request of the Moscow City Party Committee a group of scientists and specialists of the "Experimental Creative Center" state corporation, USSR Academy of Sciences research centers and institutes and other organizations have prepared a program document. The authors offer therein their vision of the paths of the country's way out of the crisis and its long-term development.

We solicit MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA readers' opinion. We await your letters.

Number to call: 259-50-43.

Preamble: Possible Scenarios of the Development of Events

We divide all the possible versions of the development of events in the country into "seven scenarios." **The first and worst is planetary catastrophe.** Is it possible on account of the disintegration of the Union? Western experts are expressing extreme concern in this connection. The growth of extremism, violence as a means of solving political problems, and the creation of a multitude of terrorist groups with "high qualifications" capable of seizing particularly dangerous facilities, including nuclear power stations, are in evidence. A decline in discipline, absence of control of production technology and absence of the requisite commands on the one hand. A mass of uncoordinated commands issued from various power levels to a disoriented responsible official forced to decide on his own with which of the mutually exclusive "orders" he should comply on the other. The politicization and division in the Army, the law enforcement authorities, and other structures, where this is absolutely impermissible and where from the viewpoint of national security iron discipline and complete unity of command should operate automatically, are perfectly obvious.

The prospect of civil war is present. But this war would not proceed in free space. It could at the end of the 20th century develop in a space stuffed with "carriers of planetary danger."

We will now summarize these factors and determine the feasibility of such a "scenario." It is quite great. There are in the world no forces that want such a turn of events. But events that no one has wanted have happened in history more than once. The situation could easily become absolutely unmanageable.

The second scenario we will call "barren land." This scenario presupposes the death of the peoples inhabiting the USSR from famine, epidemics, and interethnic conflicts amid large-scale engineering catastrophes, social explosions, and political revolutions, the terror of latter-day minidictators and so forth.

Thus it is a question once again of a catastrophe, but of one which does not go beyond the bounds of the USSR. Are there forces with an interest in such a turn of events? There undoubtedly are such. These are, first, all those who would want to extinguish a planetary conflagration, thinking that a catastrophe on the scale of the USSR is better than a catastrophe for all of civilization. Of two evils, the majority would opt for the lesser. And our neighbors could not be blamed for this. But there are also forces for which such a version could be of interest in itself.

These are the supporters of radical methods of a solution of the environmental problem thanks to a sharp reduction in the planet's population. Western scientists close to ultraright politicians of the West and, more rarely, the politicians themselves have made public statements in this connection. We are not talking about official representatives of Western states, of course. But the fact that neo-Malthusianism is becoming increasingly popular in the West in very elite circles with a capacity for influencing policy in connection with the prospects of global ecological catastrophe is common knowledge. We do not rule out supporters of such theories in our country also.

The third scenario—the "reservation." In this case the USSR becomes a backward country with no prospects and a people, slowly becoming extinct, who have become an object of new-type experiments. This version of development is being discussed far more extensively than the second. Here there are far more forces with an interest in such a development of events.

After all, various versions of such scenarios for Africa are being widely discussed. And in what way are we better? After all, the famous expression "an Upper Volta with nuclear weapons," which has been quoted with great satisfaction in our elite liberal circles, may be understood variously. Such, inter alia, that the problem amounts to the removal of the weapons, after which the USSR could develop per the scenario in store for Upper Volta. It is important to understand here an obvious fact which is being doggedly ignored by our "sixth-tenthers." Namely, that the idea of the development of all countries and the elevation of all inhabitants of civilization to the level of those which today enjoy "first-world" status is absurd. No one wants to or can act thus. Resources are limited, and the so-called "leaders" cannot allow the inhabitants of third- and fourth-world countries to develop to their level. There are not enough ecological or raw material resources to go round. This is already obvious. Long ago the West switched from the idea of development to the ideas of "limits to growth," that is, to how to ensure for the majority of mankind strict consumption quotas. So the third scenario has its supporters in the world, in our "national" oligarchies and among the international criminal world. The third scenario describes the USSR's "development" per the so-called "fourth-world" model. It is well-enough known. It is a model of the existence in our civilization of **non-developing** countries which have dropped out of history. The third scenario presupposes the total disintegration of the USSR.

The fourth scenario. The conversion of the USSR into a backward country not devoid of prospects of controlled development—a source of raw material and labor resources and a reservoir for ecologically harmful industries. **This is a model of the USSR's development per the so-called "Third-World" model.** It necessarily presupposes the partial disintegration of the country and the creation of a number of small elite-type states **controlling the bulk of the territories in the interests of the leader-countries.** Such a role in Africa is performed by countries of the South Africa type. There are even now with us claimants among the leader-republics with "their plans" relative to "secondary" republics. Nor do they in principle go to any great lengths to conceal them even. Thus many people have an interest in such a scenario. From transnational corporations seriously influencing the policy of their states through some of the former "subjects of the Union."

The block of the first four scenarios **anticipates an obvious deterioration in all indicators of the living standard for the majority of peoples of the USSR.** Even in the fourth scenario it is a question of **a lowering of the living standard no less than threefold on average.** This is not political propaganda but the result of actual calculations acknowledged by Western experts.

The fifth scenario. The USSR's entry into the "second world," among the so-called rapidly developing countries, and the conversion of the USSR into a developing country of the new type oriented toward mass **non-science-intensive** production.

The sixth scenario. The USSR's emergence among the developed countries of the "first world" utilizing the raw material, labor, and ecological resources of the globe.

The fifth and sixth scenarios represent in sum the second block. Within the framework thereof the population's living standard initially falls, but in a few years grows and approaches at the start of the next century the living standard of the new industrial countries. Thus we are talking about versions of development which, although difficult, are acceptable to considerable numbers of the USSR population. This has nothing in common, of course, with the populist assurances that are being made at this time. It is a question of a living standard appreciably different from that which is demonstrated today in advertising articles and television programs. But it is a question that must be decided by the population. It is possible that it will opt for such a development scenario as the fifth and it would most likely not reject the sixth. It is merely a question of whether such scenarios can really be implemented at this time. They were discussed in earnest at interstate, suprastate and near-state level in the first years of perestroyka. It was a question of substitution for the "East-West" model of the "North-South" model, in which the USSR would on these terms or others become part of the "North." This also included intensive discussion of the question of the possibility of our incorporation as part of a united Europe, but this is now in the past. As of 1990 the situation has been changing sharply. No one is any longer speaking of such scenarios of the development of events now other than our liberal democrats, perhaps.

Below, in the "seventh scenario" section, we will show why the USSR cannot today look for incorporation in the second or first worlds. And we will adduce specific arguments. Here, however, we would merely like to point out that in examining all the versions of events that could in the immediate future develop on the territory of the USSR we proceed from the fact that the USSR, as a system, may develop only in the event of it indicating normal goals and development prospects, these goals and prospects being openly and publicly discussed and clarity emerging. Without this we will continue our murderous progress "gropingly in the gloom." This is why the basis of our program is the discussion of actual goals, those on the far side of ideological labels.

Part 1. Goals for the USSR

1.1. From Perestroyka Toward a New Stage of the Life of Our Society

It is not the first decade that the USSR has been headed for the abyss. In the preperestroyka period this was concealed from the people by the official structures. The result of this all-embracing lie was the profound putrescence and destruction of the social fabric and the erosion of meanings and values. The essence of perestroyka consisted of telling the truth. Society was obliged to recognize the actual state of affairs. The country could be saved only by the people themselves thanks to the mobilization of their intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources. But this required restoration of the people's self-awareness. They faced a difficult spiritual test, they had essentially to **reproduce themselves in a historical framework.**

Perestroyka revealed the real alignment of forces in society. Having laid bare the scale of the erosion, it at the same time enabled all forces to give an account of themselves—from utmost radical to extremely conservative, including also potential geared to destruction. There was no other possibility, nor could there have been, of a way out of stagnation. But, having created the prerequisites for the formulation of new practicable goals, perestroyka simultaneously incorporated also the entire mechanism of a systemic crisis. The actual alignment of forces proved such that the processes became unmanageable. The recovery of sight was purchased at a price of huge costs. A polarization of forces occurred.

Instead of accomplishing a sharp turnabout toward the new goals, society began to move gropingly in the dark, and the USSR, as a system, to break up into individual parts. In this situation the question of the formation of initiating political forces capable of stating the new goals without jettisoning the positives of the restructuring period and completing in most essential fashion the construction and supplementing the definition of perestroyka is a matter of life and death. Initiating political centrism should cast aside all ideological labels serving to insinuate private mercenary ends and realize selfish political ambitions. It is duty bound to speak in categories of realism and seek realistic forms and methods of society's progress under the current actual conditions. Its task is to determine the essence of the salvation of society and find specific goals, means, and mechanisms located on the far side of political demagogy and ideological cliches. It does not have the right here to confine itself to a solution of the problem of stabilization. **There is not nor can there be today a humane project of stabilization outside of the presentation to society of a development idea.** Radicals on the left are offering society projects whose essence, however fine the words, amounts to the "passage" of society through catastrophe, the disintegration of the country and the integration, following this, of its fragments by way of their absorption by other systems. The orthodox right is proposing to throw society back and continue, after this, its progress toward false goals. Progress fraught for the country with the danger of slow extinction. Liberals speak about the integration of the USSR as a whole in world civilization, not indicating here our country's place in this civilization. Both right and left reject perestroyka as a value. The liberals, on the contrary, make an absolute of it and are attempting to spin out this groping movement in the dark, hoping here that it will be possible to avoid catastrophe. But it is advancing inexorably. Under these conditions the positive potential of perestroyka can be saved and the latter preserved from attacks from both right and left only thanks to a **new political doctrine** successive in relation to perestroyka, but not identical to it. Such a doctrine is possible only within the framework of **initiating political centrism.** While accepting the goals of perestroyka, it sharply criticizes the strategy of its implementation. Historically, it recognizes the need for it and its inadequacy, sees pros and cons therein and evaluates it as an inevitable and at the same time tragic process which is today at an end.

While declaring continuity in relation to perestroyka, initiating centrism sets new goals and proposes new mechanisms.

1.2. The USSR as a System

We have made the basis of the program an integral interdisciplinary approach. In the light of this the **independence of the USSR** is seen as a condition of survival and development for the majority of the peoples and nations inhabiting this Eurasian territory. Preserving independence means preserving the USSR as a system, that is, preserving the goals of the USSR as a single historical subject. The wishes of the peoples—to continue as an entirety—which they displayed at the referendum makes the formulation of such goals timely and necessary.

Historical experience shows that an absence of openly presented goals and substitution for them of populist demagogy signify in practice a concealment of true aims of so antihumane and antipopular a nature that it is essential that they be concealed as carefully as possible. This is why we say "No!" to any demagogy and demand discussion of the goals in point of substance, proceeding from the practicality and composition of the programs and proceeding, in turn, from these practical goals, that is, systemically and conceptually.

The concealment of goals is also possible thanks to lip service being paid to a renunciation of the conceptual approach as a principle. In this respect, talk about adherence to world experience and the vital creativity of the masses may easily be used for not presenting society with models of its development for as long as possible. In practice the "vital creativity of the masses" may be merely an essential feature connected with a transitional period, a period of the formation of concepts and ascertainment of the actual alignment of socially significant forces.

We consider it extremely important in the shaping of goals to proceed from the genetic properties and "systemic ego" of Soviet society. This is where our program differs not only from the radical utopias of the democrats but also from the main international concepts of the development of the USSR.

Unfortunately, even the best international programs proceed from the far greater proximity of our society to Western society than is the case in reality. This is why a number of the Western prescriptions which have been taken up with tremendous enthusiasm by our democratic forces could produce the most unpredictable results.

Our principle of the approach to the composition of reform programs thus consists of reliance not only and not so much even on overseas experience as on the intrinsic cultural and historical experience of our country. Borrowing world experience here we consider possible only to the extent that we can practically assimilate it.

The principle of continuity must be preserved, and accumulated potential, used in full.

The system cannot be an object of eulogy or profanation. It is a reality, and its potential should be studied and utilized. Inasmuch as in the preceding period society was notified merely of shortcomings, omissions, lags, and crime, an inadequate image of itself and its possibilities took shape therein. Objectively this was inevitable, inasmuch as it could only have been roused from the hibernation of the times of stagnation by an information shock. But the costs proved unjustifiably great to a large extent since the very shock techniques were wrong. As a result society went from extreme to extreme, and new false stereotypes, through which it is essential that we force our way once more, emerged.

In this connection **we raise the issue of the breakthrough directions, lead enterprises and highly efficient fragments which exist throughout the national economic complex, and progressive S&T developments, which exist together with really profound retardation. This is essential for determining the resources of the system.**

We pose anew the question of the state. In the preceding period the state was presented to society as an enemy. This is impermissible. The state is the basis of survival in an intricately constructed society. A strong state is the basis of any development. Only with a deeply divided consciousness is it possible to simultaneously speak about the experience of the new industrial countries and wage a war of laws. All questions of strategy may be resolved only under the influence of the state. The bureaucratic anarchy of stagnation reinforced by perestroyka is a road leading to nowhere. There cannot be prospering citizens in a weak, semi-ravaged state. **The strength of a state by no means lies in its ferocity but in its capacity for implementing a practical strategic plan in the interests of society.**

We therefore discuss in our program the question of new functions of the state in keeping with the new goals of the USSR as a system and also the conditions whereby the state becomes an efficient "engine" of the system driving it toward new goals.

We proceed throughout the set of questions from an orientation toward the formation in our country of initiating political centrism. This is not politicization but a condition for ensuring that the system retains stability. Hitherto society has existed in the political formula: radical left, orthodox right, and a balancing center seeking compromise and playing on the contradictions. Such a political line is no longer possible. Initiating centrism does not mean moderation or compromise, it means its own program, its own character, its own view, its own vision of the goals and its own modus operandi. Initiating centrism does not become lost in economics, in politics, or in philosophy. It sees a new type of society—between conservative traditionalism and radical industrialism; it sees a new type of economic system—between the consumer society and "wage-leveling"; it sees a new type of policy—between popularism and totalitarianism. And it is prepared to present to society new goals and act assertively for the sake of their realization, for the sake of their implementation.

The proposed program is also for us a step in the political consolidation of all forces oriented toward reality and action and salvation of the country and the state.

The question of the state arrangement of the Union of SSR, the type of state space in which a breakthrough into the future may be accomplished, is for us obvious. **It is federalism,** which corresponds to world practice and our traditions. However, at the present time its main condition is the existence in the country of goals and prospects. No subject of a federation would, naturally, agree to joint degradation. First a substantiated program of development providing precise reference points, then a supraparty bloc of initiating center forces as the political pivot of such a program. And after this, a normal federal state. These are the three stages necessary for the formation of the USSR as a new systemic whole. In this program we take a step toward the accomplishment of the tasks of the first stage. It is too early to discuss the second and, even more, third stages outside of this. This is why we leave out of the frame here the problem of the future arrangement of the Union.

1.3. Sociopsychological and Cultural-Historical Singularities of the USSR as a System

The radical left is today advancing the idea of the construction of a consumer society as quickly as possible. Without a moral national-historical and scientific evaluation the Korean, Japanese, German, Brazilian, Turkish, and other scenarios of various "miracles" are being tossed to society. But there are no miracles. The abandonment of moral-popular and historical self-determination and choice is a path leading to nowhere. It is an empty juggling of words.

Having truly perceived the people's resistance to a break with the traditional principles of life, the radical left is declaring that capitalism is "real socialism." Simultaneously, the right is beginning to talk increasingly emphatically about "bringing order to bear" and "calling to account" and to stimulate nostalgia in society for the era of stagnation.

The socialist choice figures also in the strategy of static centrism, which proclaims sometimes "Swedish" and sometimes "humane" socialism and sometimes "socialism with a human face."

No one here wishes to switch from symbols to reality, discussing the real goals and historical experience of the country. Any emergence from a severe systemic crisis for any society of any country and any political structure is equally connected with a **strong intellectual idea** providing for the molding of the whole spectrum of stimuli, interests, and requirements, an idea defraying by its legitimacy the social costs upon emergence from the impasse. It is this idea that is the source of any "miracle," it is the engine of any serious reform. And in this sense the history of our country has known many miracles, both before and after Peter the Great. Economic reform in our country has always proceeded thanks to the intellectual energy of the people geared to selflessly devoted, morally comprehended and, thanks to this, exceptionally efficient productive labor. The same is attested by the practice of other peoples, both European and the peoples of the new industrial countries. Their scientists and politicians are declaring candidly today that the myth of the existence of common all-purpose "miracle" prescriptions and the myth of the life-saving nature of a variety of "Marshall plans" are aimed at fooling people and at the abandonment of the vital experience of the history of these peoples.

So about what kind of idea may we speak today as a prerequisite of a breakthrough for our country?

To understand this it is necessary to closely scrutinize history, unless, of course, we wish to repeat the mistakes that led formerly to its darkest periods. The idea of collectivism, the idea of service to the country, society and the world, permeates history. The idea of the strict division of all acts into just and unjust, the idea of scorn for money-grubbing and unjust wealth, the idea of collective salvation and collective survival, the idea of the priority of qualitative indicators of life ("blessings") over quantitative indicators ("satiety"). And only on this basis the idea of super-strenuous selflessly devoted labor. All this was born not yesterday and not 73 years ago.

The basis of productive borrowing from the West should be a correlation of the types of traditional religions of the given society and the types of economic mechanisms best interfacing with them, types of cultures in the broad sense of the word and types of economic systems and types of civil consumption and production, distribution and life.

The Soviet type of culture is a special blend, which should be studied carefully for the necessary changes to be achieved as quickly as possible. It is no longer possible to demolish this type of culture and this way of thinking and feeling and to create a new Western type with its own specific features and its own pros and cons. And we can move toward the designing of reform today only by proceeding from what we have. Either the country is able to find itself a path in this spiritual organic chemistry or it will perish. If by this movement is implied "socialism," it will, consequently, be effective in the plane of a breakthrough. If such a model is offered by another political project, it will be the victor.

It is important for us to determine in the program whether such an intellectual project (however it conceives of itself ideologically) has a chance of success from the viewpoint of the trends in the development of world civilization. We examine not its yesterday but its tomorrow here. And the world's "tomorrow" is connected with ecological development and postindustrialism, not with movement toward the "consumer society." However paradoxical, the chance of the success of intellectual projects is today far higher than in 1917. We affirm that under the current conditions a "miracle" for the USSR is possible with minimal costs precisely on the path of a **breakthrough to join the leaders of world development and the design of a civilization of a new type.**

1.4. Moral Limitations

There are moral limitations, beyond which, from our viewpoint, the demolition of the USSR as a system of a particular type begins.

First, an absolutely unacceptable price for any, even the most progressive, transformations is for our people **civil war.** The increasingly open calls of radicals for the use of this extreme political means are criminal. Hopes that it would be possible to recover from a low-intensity civil war are utopian. An analysis of both our and foreign specialists shows that a carryover of armed conflict inside the country and the division of the Army would inevitably lead to devastation unprecedented in the history of mankind.

Second, an irreversible chain reaction of destructive phenomena, largely unpredictable, would inevitably be caused also by a **loss of the country's political, economic, and cultural independence.** Liberal democrats both in our country and in the West have an opposite opinion on this matter, transferring to our soil the realities of, for example, modern Europe. If such a transfer is at all rightful, it is so in respect to a very small part of the USSR. The bulk of the peoples inhabiting the country would not be accepted in the "European home" as equals and would not endure the loss of their independence of wealthy neighbors.

Third, we maintain that **unemployment and the indigence of part of society as legalized and extensive social phenomena** are an unacceptable condition for the vast majority of the population. Without going into philosophical evaluations of wage-leveling mentality, which many people consider archaic and reactionary, we have to acknowledge the reality that this mentality, expunged in the West in 300 years of domination of the market economy, is deeply rooted in the consciousness of the Soviet people and was born of its millennial history, by no means of the utopia of Marxism. Even if we cast aside feelings of solidarity and compassion, cold calculation shows that a stable society would not be created given the submergence of one-third of the population in poverty—it would be swept away by the explosions of social vengeance and new movements of the radical left. **Fourth,** finally, based on a study of international trends and a criminological analysis of our society, we maintain that under no circumstances **may organized crime be permitted to take possession of the means of political power.** The stateization of the mafia and affording it an opportunity to shape the social and economic order would be a tragedy, not only for our people but for all mankind.

Of the whole multitude of goals, only those that take account of the above limitations should be considered from the viewpoint of initiating centrism. We reject the well-known proposition that "what is effective is moral." Only that which is moral is, as the historical experience of our country shows, effective.

Morality is for us a most important resource of the system, without which it cannot develop.

1.5. Consideration of Starting Conditions Upon Determination of Goals for the USSR

There is a whole number of so-called "starting" conditions, which largely predetermine the feasibility of the goals.

We put in this category:

First, the territory of the country and its natural and climatic conditions and mineral and ecological resources. This dictates the average level of consumption which is actually attainable. **We do not and will not have access to other sources of resources obtainable by way of nonequivalent exchange.** Whereas the level of consumption of the so-called developed countries is brought about specifically by nonequivalent exchange.

Second, labor resources in the broad meaning of this word. Studies show that the vast majority of the population of the country, with its traditions, habits, and orientation toward social protection, would be unable and would not want to "play by the rules" which have been accepted by, for example, the population of Taiwan or South Korea. Some people call this "corruptness," some, "the achievements of socialism," but the essence remains the same. Intensive labor effort in our sociopsychological reality cannot be obtained either from a fear of being ejected from society or from high compensation. Other "mechanisms" are effective here.

Third, the culture born of Orthodoxy and Islam rules out the possibility of a transition to a classical Western system of incentives and motivations. Whereas socialism imposes limitations from the standpoint of the methods of labor motivation characteristic of the Asian region (fear of starvation, the unquestioning obedience reflex, and so forth are absent), cultural traditionalism places appreciable obstacles in the way of the application of classical Western methods (traditions of social Darwinism are absent, and there is not, on the whole, a taste for risk and competition, a war of all against all and the idea of survival on one's own).

In sum, the second and third conditions preclude the transference of methods of the duplication in our reality of both the experience of the developed Western countries and the experience of the new industrial countries.

Fourth, the specific structure of the system of the national economy, which is weighed down by the enormous military-industrial complex, possesses depreciated fixed capital and a broken-down infrastructure. On the one hand our industry is a "lizard" with a "head" in the form of the defense complex and a "long tail" consisting of enterprises fitted with equipment of the turn of the century, virtually. On the other, the economic system in the USSR is a system of the utmost rigidity in which virtually every enterprise is an engineering monopolist. And its exclusion from the system would destroy the latter per the "domino principle." Hence what is needed is a systemic, integral reform of the entire industrial "contour" conducted by the state in accordance with a common plan. This is world practice, but the issue is particularly acute for the USSR.

Fifth, the objective trajectory of the development of our state over many centuries. The genetic memory of the system cannot be either altered or abruptly changed by volitional decisions and may only be taken into consideration upon the formulation of practical goals.

Sixth, the arrangement of the modern world and its development trends.

Seventh, the country's present systemic crisis.

An analysis of the sum total of adduced objective conditions makes it possible to speak about the nature of the goals which may be set and realized in the USSR at the present stage of its development. And these goals must necessarily, what is more, engage the entire positive potential, **including that which has been revealed as a result of the restructuring process.** Without the formulation of goals and their strict realization the potential revealed by perestroyka will rapidly become degraded. After all, all forces of society, both constructive and destructive, were stimulated in the course of perestroyka. Here lie both the danger and the constructive prerequisites for overcoming the systemic crisis.

1.6. The "Seventh Scenario"

We spoke in the preamble about six possible scenarios of the development of events in the country. The time has now come to speak about the seventh. That in which all forces seeking alternatives to the elite world order and all peoples condemned by this order to the role of secondary peoples have an interest. In which the representatives of the "new wave" from the ranks of those who at the start of perestroyka expected the development of the idea of a civilization of a new type are interested.

So, the seventh scenario is **the USSR's joining of the leaders through the finding of its own path toward a civilization of a new type.** To have such an opportunity the USSR must agree to certain costs. The breakthrough, and it can in this case be a question only of this, will require the people's extraordinary efforts. At the same time we are forced to state that the country today no longer has propitiously moderate prospects toward which it might be possible to progress without considerable strain.

Perestroyka was implemented, evidently, on the basis of the fact that the seventh of the said versions is attended by enormous difficulties for the country and that it is desirable to seek other, more sparing versions of movement. For this reason the orientation was, as a whole, toward the sixth or fifth scenarios.

In this connection a number of the West's conditions in respect to the nature of the course of the processes in the USSR and East Europe was fulfilled, which appreciably influenced the alignment of forces both in Europe and in the world as a whole and led to the new international situation, whose contours are now largely defined.

It is a question of the new "international economic order" taking shape today before our eyes. And the more clearly the contours of this order are outlined, the more obvious it is that the scenarios ranking higher than the fourth are not envisaged therein for the USSR. Citing arguments in support of this assertion, it is necessary primarily to point to the estimates produced by Western experts which speak of the need for a restructuring of international economic relations and the growth in this connection of the competitive struggle of three centers—Europe, Japan, and the United States. At the same time, while affirming an exacerbation of the confrontation of industrial and finance capital and also various financial groupings, these experts do not anticipate favorable versions for the USSR under the conditions of the growth therein of processes of destruction. In this case there could be a spill over of all the conflicts at the expense of our country, as a source of the acquisition of superprofits, as a commodity on the international market, and as an object of buying and selling.

The restructuring of international relations in a respect unfavorable for the USSR can be seen upon an analysis of a multitude of programs and projects. And this did not begin yesterday. It has not been possible to change these trends. They are fixed in the revisions of the evolved relations in the recovery, treatment, and exports and imports of raw material, in the agricultural programs in the United States and the EEC countries, and in a multitude of other such programs. They are also fixed in the consistency of the implemented measures providing, with the help of special financial mechanisms, for the preservation of artificially low raw material prices. Also testimony to this is the consumer network of the developing countries, which is consciously controlled. This is borne out also by the growth curve of the developing countries' debt. It is necessary in connection with that same problem to discuss also the entire set of questions connected with the advancement of a new global ideology—the so-called information society. An ideology presupposing a complete revision of economic, commercial, and political relations between the developed and developing countries in the direction of an increase in the quantitative and qualitative gap between them. Account also has to be taken of the results of a number of international meetings, at which, with regard to ecological factors, a conclusion has been drawn as to the need for the formation of a world raw material market based on the actual engagement of the raw material resources of the USSR and the East European countries. It is essential to take note also of recent trends toward a change in the image of the USSR and the Soviet people in the West's mass media. The West has begun to shape a new, negative image of our country. Experts connect this with a number of top-level meetings, at which there was a change in the approach to problems of financial investments for the USSR.

Also to be evaluated are the trends toward abandonment of the "free trade" strategy and the transition to a posture of strict protectionist measures on the part of the United States, the EEC, and Japan. Given the absence of measures to protect the domestic market on the part of the USSR, there would be a sharp increase in the likelihood of the displacement of the USSR in the direction of the worst scenarios of the country's incorporation in the world division of labor.

Ever increasing seriousness is attached to the question of the subject of the costs associated with bilateral disarmament. The trend toward a shift of these costs in the direction of the USSR is obvious. It is essential to analyze here a multitude of other factors also, including the actual results of the war in Iraq.

There is no doubt that the displacement of the USSR to the remote historical periphery would subsequently rebound in extremely negative fashion on those who are today operating in this direction. It is fraught with the danger of long-term global instability and a constant, inadequately controlled regrouping of forces. All the types of geopolitical breakups, with the racist types of world hegemony in Asia and the extreme versions of the nationalist idea in Europe which they engendered, should be remembered also. But none of this disaffirms the fact that the USSR is today confronted by the need to opt for the seventh version with regard to the entire plenitude of the new geopolitical situation. Such a choice, incidentally, by no means signifies a return to the doctrine of the cold war. In the strategic plane also it corresponds to the long-term interests of all historically responsible world political forces. But the main thing is that it corresponds to the fundamental interests of the peoples of the USSR.

The events of the past year have confirmed that there are no acceptable alternatives to the seventh scenario for the vast majority of peoples which are a part of the USSR. This is why there arises with particular seriousness the question of the possible paths of realization of the seventh scenario and of whether a practical program of the requisite measures may be implemented within its framework.

The seventh scenario does not conflict with the system of moral limitations, does not undermine civil peace, does not require unemployment on the scale of a social disaster and does not pose the question of a loss of the country's independence, being oriented toward the personality type who makes the interests of the country of paramount importance.

It is opposed to the criminal type of enterprise and cuts off from power the criminal strata of our society.

The seventh scenario presupposes an emphasis on the cultural and historical distinctiveness of the country. It makes it possible to engage the intellectual potential of society and incorporate its traditional mechanisms.

This scenario does not take society back and preserves the positive potential of perestroyka.

The seventh scenario is oriented toward the country's intrinsic resources and orients its population toward living by its own resources, not thanks to nonequivalent exchange with countries of the third world.

The seventh scenario creates a field for current motivations, incorporates strong motivational mechanisms and orients people toward creation, not "getting."

This scenario puts the emphasis on the state, as the engine of the system, and the leading part of science, industry, agriculture, and culture, as the social base.

The seventh scenario, while adjusting the trajectory of development, does not break with the country's traditions and the type of its movement in historical space.

Finally, **the seventh scenario** proceeds from the realities of geopolitics, where strength and interest rule.

All this in toto speaks of the chosen scenario as a practicality. And makes it possible to set goals on the basis thereof.

1.7. Final Choice of Goals

Having examined all possible versions of the development of events, having analyzed the limits within whose framework the USSR might develop by a noncatastrophic path and having analyzed the correlation of domestic and foreign policy factors, the level of the stability of the country as a system and its type and potential and the scale of the destructive processes, we conclude that the program for the surmounting of the systemic crisis should proceed from two related goals: survival and development within the framework of the seventh scenario, that is, via a breakthrough to join the leaders thanks to the finding of a path toward a civilization of a new type.

For such a system as the USSR this extreme version is today already more probable from the viewpoint of successful realization than the others—the moderate versions.

Stabilization as such, without the formation of development goals, is ineffective. A crisis of a systemic nature may only be combated if one has a clear understanding of what will happen after it has been surmounted. **Detachment of the problems of stabilization from the problems of development is immoral and ineffective.** It essentially destabilizes the situation, despite the assurances of opposite intentions.

The crisis has today reached a speed at which stabilization is already impossible. It may be accomplished only after a catastrophe, on which extreme right and extreme left forces are counting.

The model we propose rejects stabilization via catastrophe and offers in place of this a strategy of breakthrough for realization of the seventh scenario. Its formula is movement in the channel of clearly defined goals at the maximum speed, whereby the system does not have time to collapse, despite the fact that it is moving in a most aggressive environment. **The system will be saved here thanks to the fact that recognition of the goals enhances its stability, and the time of movement through the aggressive environment is minimal.**

A package of reforms is drawn up in this program, the orientation being toward survival, a particular type of development and breakthrough strategy as the three basic components.

Part 2. Paths of Realization of the Outlined Goals

2.1. The State and the Economy

A most prevalent myth is that of the market economy not controlled by the state. There is in practice no such economy in the world today. Everywhere, particularly in countries which have accomplished a rapid forward surge, the state appreciably influences economic processes.

Having created two autonomous subsystems—the state and the economy—on the site of the industrial and state monster of the barrack-like-administrative system, perestroyka should thereby have reinforced management of the economy on the part of the state, not destroyed it.

But an autonomous industrial and economic subsystem was not created, and the state having been disconnected, the economy was deprived even of that inefficient managerial infrastructure which it had had prior to perestroyka, and was essentially thereby condemned to destruction.

Having focused all attention on the market and private ownership and having converted these instruments of management of the economy from means into an end in themselves, the entire set of questions connected with the new system of management of the country's industrial-economic complex was lost sight of in the course of perestroyka, control over its functioning and development were lost, and the economic system was destabilized by our own hands. **Today's crisis is essentially a crisis of the management of production, not a crisis of production itself,** and we may overcome it only by having resolved the problem of management of the national economy in all its fullness, not returning here to the barrack-like-administrative system, within whose framework the state would be deprived of the possibility of resolving strategic problems and development problems.

To prevent our society finding itself in the grip of stagnation once again, finding itself cast back into totalitarianism, it is essential to fundamentally restructure its entire managerial infrastructure. The main step is the separation in the system of the sustenance and development of society of two main autonomous subsystems: industrial-economic and state.

The release of the state for development (and by no means the removal thereof) presupposes the creation of an integral economic-legal mechanism of management activity which incorporates:

First, the introduction of a system of economic, not command, methods of management of the economy on the part of the state represented by organs of state administration in the form in which they exist today in any market economy. While not interfering directly in enterprises' economic activity (which should be strictly punished), these organs simultaneously have the right to issue licenses and exert influence via the system of taxation and all methods of stimulation, price control, distribution of material resources, government commissions profitable to a business executive and other economic levers.

Second, the introduction of a system providing for high labor discipline via a contract method of hire, a system of the payment of bonuses and increased legal and material responsibility for a breach of labor and production engineering discipline fraught with catastrophic consequences.

Third, the immediate restoration and strengthening of a common system of bank control severed by ill-conceived reform and also the shedding from the common banking network of the system of commercial banks. It would be expedient to preserve the commercial banks here, but only after having incorporated them in the common network.

Fourth, the just-as-immediate restoration of the system of financial regulation and the strengthening of state tax inspection and the imparting to it of all-union status.

Fifth, the introduction of free prices only in the sphere of goods not in short supply and luxury items. The establishment of prices with a uniform base profitability level.

Sixth, without switching once again to a state foreign trade monopoly, to implement a whole set of measures pertaining to the creation of a system of state protectionism in this vitally important sphere. To place joint ventures under conditions requiring of them the creation of highly efficient production and investment in the production process.

Seventh, the restoration of the all-union registration of state-owned enterprises and the stage-by-stage stock taking of their fixed capital.

Eighth, strict delineation in the question of ownership between union, republic, and municipal structures. The creation of workable organs of management of state property in place of today's inactive committees and foundations.

2.2. Economic Reforms

We were forced in drawing up development strategy to proceed from socioeconomic reality. An objective given is the centralized economic system.

The new economic system, oriented toward man, may "grow" merely from the current national economic complex together with the new social relations.

The policy of the achievement of new goals with different preferences requires of us the accomplishment of two contradictory tasks. On the one hand it is necessary to alter the structure and quality of the actual economic system and, on the other, it is essential to ensure the social protection of the people's masses.

The contradiction of these tasks is prescribed by the objective laws of social development, which make for a direct dependence between the scale of economic transformations and the extent of their social costs for the population.

Under these conditions it is socially dangerous to adopt merely a one-dimensional set of instruments of transformations—either the plan (the command approach) or the market (spontaneity). World experience shows that the effective management of the development of any intricately organized process requires the existence and complementarity of two systems of pressure: at the upper level, the level of "highest nervous activity," the plan and state control via economic mechanisms and the shaping of goals and motivations common for all participants; at the lower level, the level of "vegetative nervous activity," the market, property diversification, competition, and price and income alteration. Given the combination of these complementary and mutually contradictory aspects of management, it is easier to find the sphere of social costs, sacrifices and expenditure equal for each and everyone during a period of transformations and, subsequently, of the acquisition of just-as-equal opportunities for social mobility, economic dynamics, and the assurance of firm social protection in subsequent phases.

Something else is clear also: that, given a return to rule by administrative decree, positive changes cannot be achieved. The social costs of preservation of the unitary-totalitarian system of social and economic life would ultimately prove infinitely greater than the costs necessary for transformations.

There is no need to once again proclaim and show the division of state and economic structures. But such a division cannot be absolutely total. Only by reliance on the power of the state and via channels of special goal-oriented and long-term programs is it possible to assist the rapid concentration of sufficient capital, labor, and S&T resources at the points of breakthrough to the new socioeconomic structures. Without the creation of the latter, perestroyka will prove to have been a period of destruction, not creation.

Reform of Property Relations

Denationalization of industrial and municipal property is a logical step of progress toward a new economy and a new society. It is wrong to see this as a division between people on account of a sharp reduction in the sphere of state ownership. Privatization could bring people together via collective systems of ownership and administration and could also, on the contrary, erect between them new barriers in place of the old ones—it all depends on the form of its implementation.

We cannot agree to the privatization of all state ownership in the form of selling off property to private individuals on the free market. The Soviet economy has for many decades developed mainly as a system of large and superlarge industries closely interconnected by supplies of raw material, energy, batching components, and semimanufactured goods. The form of ownership under these conditions cannot be altered as abruptly as to sever evolved business ties.

On the other hand, servicing these ties is beyond the capacity of private capital. Ownership of the current industrial giants can only be **associated.**

In addition, privatization is to be carried out for the good of the people, not in the interests of the 10 percent of the population which concentrates no less than 38 percent of total monetary income.

Whence ensue both the conditions of privatization and its acceptable mechanism. The state issues symbols of ownership in the form of "people's shares" with a total value equal to the actual (residual) value of the fixed capital. These shares are distributed on egalitarian principles among all actual participants in the creation of national revenue, in the preceding period included; that is, among retirees. The "people's shares" are not freely transferable and are not an object which may be bought and sold; that is, may not be traded securities. They determine the extent of the participation of a given physical person in the overall extent of privatization of state property. Such shares may be taken into consideration in the process of privatization of municipal property by the local soviet as a symbol of value at the time of the acquisition of housing and nonresidential premises with payment in full or payment of the difference in price. The shares may be taken into consideration upon the official registration of collective ownership at the place of work (for members of the work force) with the corresponding participation in the distribution of enterprise income. "People's shares" should be endowed with the function of means of payment for the acquisition of means of production for private ownership. These shares could be pledge documents in credit and financial bodies in support of a loan for production purposes and could also be used in the form of grounds for the official registration of the permanent leasing of land for the purpose of agricultural production, given preservation of the pledge characteristics.

Upon the formation of associated property, the work force, the participants in the privatization process, exercise, should they so desire, complete right of administration, possession and use of the given production (economic) facility, and officially draw up power of attorney for management of the regulated and above-quota working capital of the privatized enterprise and its depreciation fund (in accordance with replacement value) by a fixed-term bill of exchange. It is issued on behalf of the work force to the state, and loan interest thereon is computed at a specially devised rate. The collective of this enterprise has the right, in order to pay off the bill, to attract the savings of its employees and the collective's consumption funds formed as the result of production activity and loan capital obtained from other than state sources. As a result, if the bill is paid off, all the "people's shares" taken into consideration by this collective are declared void, and securities (shares and such) which are current in stock transactions are issued for the aggregate total value of the privatized production capital.

Thus the broadest diversification of forms of ownership precisely in accordance with specific conditions and geared to the achievement of the maximum economic efficiency of labor activity is possible. The system of the pledging of "people's shares" in financial and credit institutions makes it possible to ensure the responsible investment of state and other resources for the support of cooperative, family, private, and venture (in the fields of creative activity) enterprise.

Naturally, given this type of privatization, the corresponding changes in the social quality of the participants will occur gradually, enabling the new social and economic relations to "mature" also.

Agrarian Reform

The principle of continuity of the reforms presupposes that the transition to mixed forms of management in the agrarian complex must not become a campaign of the forcible destruction of the high-income kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms]. The experience of such dismantling of the kolkhozes has encountered real difficulties, for example, in the Baltic republics, where the kolkhoz form of production is far "younger" than in the vast majority of other parts of the country.

Support on the part of the state for tenant farming in the immediate future does not signify the supplanting of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes but will organize healthy relations of competition and mutual support in the agrarian complex. The question is as follows: either support for tenant farming via a mechanism of state and budget subsidies or an unchecked growth of food prices.

The highest professionalism of the labor of the tenant farmer- agriculturalists and the application of special systems of land utilization, production intensification and provision with machinery and equipment appropriate precisely for this type of production are required for this type of agrarian production. As of the present time we have in the USSR neither a general high quality of agrarian labor nor a mass system of training professional farmers nor the corresponding system of implements and means of labor. Preservation of archaic systems of land utilization will not produce the anticipated effect, however.

The goals set agrarian reform may be achieved only in the context of long-term state programs.

This means primarily the special training of farmer personnel both at the level of specialized secondary and higher agricultural education. At the same time, however, it is essential to create systems of long-term investment hypothecary credit with regard for permanent leasing of the land. It is necessary to organize with the assistance of the state preferential investment flows of resources both in the direction of new subjects of agricultural production and the group of branches providing for the manufacture of the corresponding means of labor. And, what is more, investments in the machine-building complex should be preferential.

It should be said also that there are sufficiently serious conditions determining a framework for the choice of versions of agrarian reform.

First, the permanent leasing of land is acceptable as a form of the possession and use thereof only for agricultural production. For productive activity of another kind the basic principle is term leasing of the land.

Second, all unworked agricultural land should be confiscated from the present managers and switched to state-land status. The official registration of permanent-lease deeds should not be accompanied by any conditions other than verification of the professional training of the lease holders and follow-up supervision of use of the land as specified.

Third, the establishment of the maximum quotas of agricultural land per lease holder requires the cadastral revaluation of land and the establishment of the maximum preferential investment quotas. Over and above these quotas investments are made in the commercial mechanism.

Fourth, the new subject of agricultural production is accorded special privileges in fields of agricultural activity pertaining to highly profitable types thereof:

pedigree stock breeding;

seed-bearing plant growing;

production of environmentally clean agricultural products;

production of industrial raw material of agrarian origin.

Fifth, head agricultural works (kolkhozes, sovkhozes) exercising on-the-spot assistance in the establishment of tenant farming in a given region within the framework of the state program are determined for each territory with an average register of taxable land.

Sixth, the subject of such a state program and all types of state support is the association of tenant farmers of a given region.

Seventh, investments in and the organization of industrial complexes processing the primary agricultural product and the creation of the corresponding capacity for the storage of the primary agricultural product are effected within the framework of the state program for the associated subject—the regional tenant farmer associations.

Given state support of the new agrarian structures, the task of society is the elaboration and realization of special goal-oriented programs of the creation and development of science and production associations of the joint-labor type with the enlistment of the achievements of world S&T thought and foreign investment capital in the form of a holding company. This will create a system of the technical, mechanical engineering, data, and infrastructural support for all types of private and family production and specialized and highly marketable production generally. Only on this basis is it possible to efficiently build new forms of agrarian-production relations on the land.

The simple declaration of the introduction of private ownership of the land, however, would make no appreciable improvements to the fulfillment of the food program from the viewpoint of the people's fundamental interests. On the contrary, this would lead to negative social phenomena: namely, the actual dispossession of the masses of the rural population of the land.

Understandably, the implementation only of these programs of support for the development of the tenant farms even will require the mobilization of the country's monetary and investment resources. But the tasks of state-economic strategy are even more extensive. Whence also the need for a more powerful system of the accumulation of monetary and investment resources as a priority task.

Reform of Finances and Prices

A prerequisite of the elaboration of a state program of the stabilization of monetary circulation should be an understanding of the fact that the price reform of April 1991 is merely a means of the approximate regulation of the gap between wholesale and retail prices and does not tackle more substantive tasks.

Systemic price reform along the entire chain of shaping socially necessary expenditure from the extraction of primary materials through the manufacture of the end product with regard for rent payments remains an urgent necessity. It is a question of the balanced nature of all prices at any point of the production process reflecting the dynamics of the actual expenditure of society.

Such price reform lies ahead. It should be considered also that under the conditions of the shortages a simple, unbalanced revision of prices devoid of the corresponding tax support would be engulfed by unsated, inflexible consumer demand.

The absence of strict control over the movement of monetary resources under the conditions of stagflation is leading to a reduction in the amount of long-term credit oriented toward the expansion and development of production, and the increasing cost of loan resources and the reduction in the credit term are spurring unchecked inflation.

Whence it follows that:

First, only a blocking of the processes of increased stagflation may be achieved in the first year of implementation of the stabilization of monetary circulation. No less than 80 billion rubles [R] of cash and monetary resources will be tied up annually in the process of liquidating exchange certificates in the people's privatization program. Approximately R120 billion will not enter cash and monetary circulation from the distribution of the consumption funds accounted in the noncash liquidation of exchange certificates. At the same time, however, short-term and medium-term credit in noncash form in a total amount of up to R120 billion annually will be attracted for servicing turnover in social production.

Further, clearing transactions at the time of the reregistration of property in the municipal economy will additionally tie up up to R17 billion in the first year of the process of the privatization of residential and nonresidential premises. Up to R12 billion could be obtained in the second year. Subsequently these receipts will decline proportionately and absolutely and will become negligible.

The unregulated prices of luxury items and types of products not in short supply may tie up cash and monetary resources to the extent of no more than R5-R7 billion annually in the increase in the overall total of supply market commodity prices.

At the same time the organization of the investment process, even under conditions of inflationary emission in production, will ensure a **new market for consumers:** specialized producer goods and small-scale mechanization and peripheral facilities and optimum and quite diversified equipment of the machine-tool stock. At the second stage (in the second year) it will produce a negligible increase in additional amounts of the social product in the nonstate sphere of production and an explosive growth thereof in the third year. It is estimated that the reflexivity of the entire invested (to this end) amount of state and other resources with the additional tie-up of no less than 30 percent of the cash and paper money in circulation will have been secured within three years.

Second, the national currency in the USSR is restricted and cannot at this time be based on mechanisms of direct conversion in exchange for open world currencies (freely convertible currency). At the same time it should be considered that **different** accounting means of payment are employed in current intra-union settlements under the general name of the national currency of the USSR—the ruble.

Settlements in convertible means of payment in the process of the formation of consumption funds for the production of primary raw materials for export should not be permitted. These resources should, as a rule, be used to provide investment support for processes of the transition to the production of complex (finished) export products and import substitution.

Upon realization of the state financial and price programs there will be an appreciable change in the rights, functions, and place of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] as the national bank of issue, to which all banks of the state, regardless of their affiliation and forms of ownership, are **economically** subordinate.

A no less significant and essentially equivalent measure is the introduction of a tax policy as a protectionist system with flexible tax relationships both as a system of allowances and as a system of protective tariffs providing maximum allowances for the development of import-substituting, export-efficient, and science-intensive industries with extensive reliance on holding-company relationships with foreign investors against official guarantees of the USSR Government.

A preferential right within the framework of the investment policy of transfer of state credit resources in national currency will be enjoyed by the "slow" or infrastructural economy. Such investments are confronted primarily with the task of securing a qualitative change in the industrial outline of the USSR in the direction of a move into the world division of labor with its own national complex, finished product.

Third, the 1991 price reform will not remove the causes of instability of the consumer market, and there is a great probability of further price rises. Sharp differentiation of the population in terms of level of income, expenditure, and savings has come about.

The nonelasticity of demand and the domination on the market of the well-to-do strata of the population is leading to aggregate demand being insufficiently elastic in terms of price. Under these conditions there is an increase in the producer's income at the time of a price rise even given a reduction in sales in physical terms. Price increases and a decline in production will continue until aggregate demand becomes sufficiently elastic.

In this situation a regulating influence on prices may be exerted by a tax policy of redistribution of income with emphasis on a limitation of the latter for the well-to-do strata of the population. This would increase the number of consumers whose demand depends on the level of prices. Ultimately a stimulus to the growth of the production of commodities would emerge also.

Fourth, a solution to the crisis and assurance of our economy's progressive development are impossible without a recovery in the country's balance of payments in the sense of the balanced nature of foreign economic relations. At the same time we need to seek to rule out situations of speculative foreign influence on the ruble. This is exceptionally important upon the transition to work in accordance with the laws of the market and under the conditions of our economy's acquisition of multi-dimensional properties. After all, a growing number of nontraditional economic subjects is embarking upon foreign economic relations, which demands particular attention to the problem of observance of general state interests.

2.3. Reform of the Technical-Economic and Scientific Base

Industry

The industrial type of production has over a long period of time for various reasons, including geopolitical, been reproduced and augmented in the country's national economy. Up to a certain time here it was possible to increase the purely quantitative indicators of the results of economic activity at any price. Ideologized permanent quantitative growth afforded no opportunity for the accomplishment in good time of the necessary structural rearrangements either on the scale of the whole economy or in its individual production units. As a result the structure of the economy has found itself in a phase of such profound deformation that not only the transition to economic methods of management, but also the implementation of measures of a stabilization nature have been seriously complicated. If we are speaking of the imposition of market relations on the evolved structure of the economy, such an experiment would inevitably lead to the complete breakdown of the economic system against a background of mimicry of the market.

A substantial proportion of labor and material resources today is diverted by the long-term investment complex, including the defense industry, which has essentially been taken outside of the common national economic complex and, consequently, may be managed only by purely command methods. A considerable inflationary charge is contained in the hypertrophied production of producer goods, which lost innovation potential on the frontier of the 1960's-1970's. This sphere is inadequately oriented toward engineering support for the manufacture of products of final demand. The national economy is furnished predominantly with obsolescent and obsolete equipment. The absence of a degree of balance and the low quality of the equipment employed are exerting power pressure on the extractive sector of the economy. A resource-extravagant type of management working for itself is as a result taking shape and being reproduced. Given low labor motivation, among the reasons for which is the inadequate level of development of the social sphere, an influx of new manpower and the corresponding material resources in production is a constant requirement. The limits of this type of development are obvious.

A most important role in the removal of the disproportions undoubtedly belongs to the management mechanism and the impact of economic levers incorporating also a reform of the market interpretation. But the experience of countries which have implemented modernization and structural improvements in the economy shows that such large-scale operations necessarily require **direct state participation.** It may be manifested in the form of various combinations of methods of administrative-command and indirect economic regulation. This is urgent to a more-than-usual extent for the economic space of our country—heterogeneous in terms of level of economic development and social provision.

It should be emphasized that without structural reorganization under our actual conditions the transition even to rudimentary forms of the market will inevitably lead to the absolute loss of any control of the socioeconomic process. The entire experience of the past 6 years testifies to this. It is of appreciable importance that **structural changes may be accomplished in any way successfully only on condition of technological modernization conducted simultaneously.** Otherwise neither the creation of superdepartments nor the granting of rights to enterprises will cope with the problem of the achievement of balance. Economic deformation will not be eliminated merely by the replacement of managerial forms without a fundamental improvement in the quality of resources and the surmounting of the disproportions.

For the purpose of conducting modernization the state must organize control of export earnings from exports of raw material, energy resources primarily. It is essential to spend foreign currency receipts in priority fashion on satisfaction of the citizens' basic vital requirements and goal-oriented modernization programs. The use of foreign currency resources to acquire commodities which may in our specific situation be classed as luxury items should be prohibited.

For the purpose of resource support for the initial stage of modernization and structural reorganization the stock taking of enterprises, primarily of the long-term investment complex, in two areas [as published] is essential:

—first, to ascertain the enterprises which are poles of the subsequent diffusion of science-intensive products and technology (particularly in the defense complex);

—second, to ascertain the enterprises subject to reprofiling for the manufacture directly of products of final demand or means catering for such manufacture;

—third, to ascertain the possibilities of the creation of import-substituting industries;

—fourth, to ascertain the monopolist enterprises in this sphere of production activity or the other.

All these measures ultimately correspond to the goals of the modernization and social orientation of the economy simultaneously.

The attraction of foreign capital investments may also be regarded as a resource source of the modernization and structural reorganization of our economy. Specifically, utilizing foreign techniques of the conversion of natural and petroleum gas with the subsequent export of valuable components, the USSR's conversion into a "raw material appendage" of the developed countries could be avoided inasmuch as in this case products of a higher degree of processing than, for example, crude oil would be exported.

Modernization automatically changes working conditions at the enterprises, adding a wide spectrum of motivation to the principle of material interest.

The state's structural and investment policy should create an economy prepared for full-fledged functioning under the conditions of market relations. It is essential for this to reduce the spheres of the expenditure of investments in inefficient areas, sharply enhance the quality of the long-term investment complex and expand the production and resource base of the socially oriented sectors of the economy.

It is necessary to complete in respect of the new tasks principles of the state centralized regulation of the economy. These should be a set of goal-oriented comprehensive programs, each of which contains specific, functional, structural, and balance levels. The main attention should be paid to resource support for achievement of the set goals. Given management of the state sector, noneconomic methods of regulation are permissible inasmuch as the market system would not under our specific conditions accomplish the structural and long-term investment maneuver within an acceptable time frame.

Conversion

The problem of conversion of the defense industry is being perceived exceptionally painfully by the public consciousness. This is connected with the fact that large collectives of highly skilled workers and engineers and research staff are being broken up, unique production processes are being destroyed, and technological potential is being lost. Labor at the defense plants is losing its traditionally high prestige. This process has not been supported in the scientific and propaganda respects, which is engendering in various strata of society serious concern and fears for the country's defense capability.

It should be affirmed that two basic approaches to the mechanism of conversion of the defense complex in the USSR have taken shape at the present time. Neither of them accomplish the tasks of development of the economy and society as a whole and are capable merely of making the situation worse.

The first path represents **conservative or extensive conversion,** which is connected with the adoption of exceptionally extravagant programs which fail to take account of the depth of the economic and financial crisis in the country. Its essence is that the multibillion-ruble sums spent on arms and military hardware are determined by the introduction of new prices for these products with regard for the reduction in the series nature of their production, subsidies to enterprises which have become unprofitable in connection with conversion, and expenditure on the temporary closure of production shops. Such conversion will merely make the situation in the monetary-finance and long-term investment spheres worse.

The second path, which is proposed by a number of economists, may be called **radical or shock conversion.** It presupposes the instantaneous closure of one-half and more enterprises, particularly those which manufacture material- and energy-consuming products. Account is not taken here of the catastrophic consequences of the rapid closure of such enterprises connected with millions of highly skilled workers, engineers, and employees who constitute the professional nucleus of the defense complex being left without work. Nor has shock conversion been coordinated with maintenance of the country's defense capability and could for a long period of time put out of action entire structural complexes for the production of military equipment.

Essential under these conditions is a third path—**intensive conversion,** which may be implemented on the basis of the following conditions:
given the precise correlation of the necessary defensive sufficiency and the goals of reprofiling defense complex enterprises;
given the comprehensive stock taking of all enterprises of the defense complex with the enlistment of groups of experts, scientists, and national economy specialists for the purpose of determination of the enterprises and science and production complexes capable of producing competitive products for their introduction on the home and world markets;
given the creation of a policy of strict protectionism in respect of such enterprises and the redistribution of financial resources and reserve materials for the creation of the most propitious conditions for the enterprises capable of engaging in an equal competitive struggle with overseas firms, concerns, and corporations;
given assurance of conditions of a full guarantee of retraining and instruction and the receipt of monetary compensation for employees of enterprises of the defense complex which the state will be forced to close as truly hopeless;
given the constant coordination of this work with the research collectives.

Science

The past long historical path of Soviet science has evolved into a system of scientific activity which is large in scale and very specific in terms of its organization. This is a distinctive and strong science which is rooted in the national culture and which is experiencing all the ailments of society here.

If a process is allowed to drift, new relations are established by an uncontrolled method. For science this situation could prove fatal inasmuch as science is a fragile formation which cannot remain intact without the financial and organizational support of stable state structures. Nor can science be restructured "spontaneously." Unless the "subject of perestroyka" in the country proves strong, the science formed in the old system will simply break down and cease to exist. There will be a break in continuity, and merely the hope of the emergence of new scientific structures in a new settled economic system will remain.

The break with the old management mechanism in the country without its adequate replacement led to the foundations of the stable financing and provision of science with material and technical resources being undermined. The secret liquidation, not sanctioned by the political authorities, of research institutes began. The sociopsychological climate in the research worker milieu changed abruptly.

All this engendered a phenomenon qualitatively new in terms of its motivation and structure—an orientation toward the mass emigration of scientists and S&T personnel. This is both an effect and an important indicator of the crisis of the scientific system.

Under these conditions it is essential to formulate and implement urgent measures to ensure the viability of the scientific potential of the USSR (no later than mid-1991, what is more) and a state program of the reorganization of science, having determined the scale of this system with guaranteed survival.

The following urgent steps are possible in respect of branch science: prohibiting the liquidation of all research institutes and design bureaus by decisions of ministries and departments; the financing of their existence for 1991; the creation of a flexible structure of small research collectives both under the auspices of the research institutes and outside of centralized control; the urgent shaping of an infrastructure making it possible to create jobs for the scientific associates who, given a possible reduction in the research institute network, would go to new research structures.

Basic research has found itself in the most vulnerable position in the current situation. At the present time there are quite a large number of fields in domestic basic research whose level not only is not inferior to, but superior to the foreign level. A detailed stock taking of domestic science compared with world science has shown that in any branch of science there are leading, breakthrough scientific developments and a kind of "antenna" extended far ahead of the line of the world scientific front.

Even in spheres where the lag is, on average, assessed as being catastrophic (40-50 years), there are breakthroughs, efforts, and developments surpassing the world level where Soviet scientists have proceeded by a fundamentally new path. The world scientific community recognizes the priority nature of such developments, their pioneering nature, and their specific translatability into practice. It is possible to speak of a "second science" characterizing the sum total of leading Soviet developments in 150 branches. Its potential is undoubtedly sufficient for a breakthrough.

The sphere of basic research should be based entirely on resources of the state budget. **Firm material support on the part of the state for the level of basic research which has been achieved is essential inasmuch as overcoming a lag here is impossible.**

Applied research should become an organic part of the structure of economic activity. Its results will be claimed by the new subjects of economic initiative. It is essential to formulate the mutual interest of the entrepreneur and the inventor. The creator of new equipment should, following its introduction, have the right to creative compensation of the order of up to five percent of the amount of the net profit for a minimum of 10 years. These sums, as also the profits of the enterprise introducing the new equipment, will be taxable at a reduced preferential rate.

Financial policy in respect of basic and applied research, informal scientific societies and inventors, and efficiency experts should be based on the principle according to which creativity generally cannot be valued via the concept of "wealth"—it is a special attribute of the individual. And however much this individual receives from society, the fairness of any compensation is commensurate only to the amount which this individual has given society.

A policy of protectionism in respect of domestic science and the enterprises selling new domestic equipment is essential. The most wide-ranging tax allowances are appropriate here, particularly to those who develop and introduce the production of import-substituting products. Only thus is it possible to gradually convert the country from an exporter of raw material into an equal competitor on the world market of products with a high degree of processing.

Inventors and creative workers should be accorded the most extensive rights for realizing their share of income in productive capital investments, primarily in the sphere of venture creative activity (science-intensive production). World practice has cultivated models worthy of emulation in this sphere.

2.4. Social Costs and Social Results

The set of economic reforms is being implemented not only to ensure economic growth in the post-crisis period but also to achieve social results. As yet, however, until we emerge from the crisis, the state's economic policy should be geared to the minimization and equal distribution among groups of the population of the social costs of the production slump and the burdens of social restructuring.

The highest social goal of the social and political and economic transformations consists of the solution of the fundamental contradiction between the limited motives of the participant in the labor process ensuing from relations of hire and the social nature of the means and results of production. In other words, it is a question of a surmounting of the worker's alienation, which is inherent in both the administrative-command and liberal-market models of the economy.

The denationalization of property only makes any sense from the viewpoint of society in that it resolves the said contradiction by way of endowment of each worker with an equal share of property rights to the means of production catering for his labor.

Under the conditions of growing income differentiation the sole acceptable method of the denationalization of property is "public privatization." It will block the explosive growth of the working people's property inequality at the initial stages of emergence from the crisis and ensure to a certain extent equal starting positions for all citizens of the country on the eve of the economic upturn. In accordance with the working people's wishes, the "public shares" may be used to improve their families' social living conditions. Possession of "public shares" presupposes the "one man, one vote" principle in the realization of the process of enterprise management.

It has come about historically that in our country the social protection of the citizens has been undertaken by the state and to a considerably lesser extent by the workforce. This is a major social gain of the people. Our experience of the provision of the citizens with social safeguards on the part of the state has been apprehended in the West also, where it has been appreciably developed. As of the present time a system of the triple level of social protection of the individual has taken shape there: at the state level, pensions and insurance against unemployment, sickness, accidents, and natural disasters; at the company and corporate level, pensions, insurance against catastrophic illness, and assurance of annuities and inheritance of property rights; at the family-personal level, a wide spectrum of services of insurance companies and retirement funds and the possibility of the investment of personal assets in income-producing property. We should now borrow some of this experience for our system of social protection, that is, supplement state with collective and family-personal safeguards.

State social safeguards must under no circumstances be weakened prior to our emergence from the crisis. The organization of the retraining of the manpower released in a number of sectors is required primarily on the part of the state undertaking the structural reorganization of the economy and modernization. At this stage of the economic upturn all three levels of social protection should be engaged to an equal extent. And "public privatization" creates, what is more, a basis for the development of the collective, group, and family-private levels of social safeguards for the citizens.

"Public privatization" will enable the citizens to invest resources in real estate, the price of which will under conditions even of strong inflation grow more rapidly than for goods in current demand. A new mechanism of protection of the working people's savings under inauspicious economic circumstances will thereby be created.

The modernization of production objectively requires and contains within itself the prerequisites of a humanization of social and labor relations. An increase in the grading of labor, the careful expenditure of human capital, paternalism, support for small businesses, an enhanced sense of personal responsibility for the results of labor, a rapprochement in the living standard and way of life of the participants in production, collective methods of work and interests—all these will create additional motivations, aside from a growth of income, for a growth of economic efficiency. Thus modernization is not a technocratic program but directly influences simultaneously both the economic and social results of business activity.

The state's structural and investment policy should provide the necessary resources to the following goal-oriented programs: production, environmental, health protection, housing, and the production of consumer durables.

The state provides for equalization of the socioeconomic conditions and the living standard of the population on the country's territory by way of indicative planning (via fiscal allowances, subsidies, preferential credit) and direct participation (in the form of the channeling of resources into social disaster zones).

The declaration on introduction of the private ownership of land will make no appreciable improvements from the viewpoint of the people's fundamental interests in fulfillment of the food program. On the contrary, this declaration will lead to the rural population's mass dispossession of the land and will have negative social consequences. The price of agricultural products and food will rise sharply as a result of the monopolization of the agrarian sector in the form of large landed estates.

The emergence of tenant farming and a solution of the food problem in the country are impossible in the foreseeable future outside of state protectionism. What is obviously needed is a system of training for new rural proprietor personnel. It is essential to do this sooner than the future farmers come to have sufficient resources to pay for such training. Private and collective capital will hardly be capable of solving this problem in a short time and in full. Hence a state goal-oriented program is needed. It would have an additional social effect in the form of a reduction in the negative consequences of structural unemployment, and the released manpower could be better and more rapidly used for a revival of the countryside.

The permanent leasing of state-owned land as a form of the organization of tenant farms has an important social advantage compared with private land tenure. In this case there is no land market or speculation in plots of land, which would entail, as world experience shows, a ratcheting-up of prices. As a result citizens' even access to land would be made more difficult. Land speculation at inflated prices would bleed tenant farming white and impede the development of agricultural production.

The sharp differentiation in income possible in the transitional period will weaken the stimulating role of economic levers in the growth of the commodity supply, erect a barrier to positive changes in the structure of demand, contribute to the emergence of focal points of social tension, and lower the population's living standard. The essential movement of prices toward an equivalent level should in this connection be combined with differentiated income indexation. In the transitional period any policy of state subsidies, unless it distorts the price structure and is of the nature of incentive-deadening charity, has, besides the social, a purely pragmatic significance.

Of course, in the period of crisis and emergence from it only an active state policy is capable, if not of alleviating as a whole, of evening out the burden of social costs. Combined with market self-organization, this policy could shorten the duration of the crisis phase. The fruits of the transformations, on the other hand, would pay for the sacrifices quite quickly, new opportunities for a growth of social mobility and income would emerge, the economy would become more dynamic, and the social protection of the working people would be ensured at three levels, not only in the form of state safeguards. Under the conditions of a return to administrative rule, however, such prospects would disappear completely, and the sacrifices that have already been made would become totally meaningless.

2.5. National and Economic Security

By the start of perestroyka highly organized antisocial forces existed in society: the corrupt part of the party and state bureaucracy and mafia structures. It was they who flooded into the vacuum that formed upon the break with the administrative structures, actively breaking up these structures and enriching themselves under the conditions of chaos. The criminals were handed tremendous startup capital as a result of the anti-alcohol campaign, which not only engendered a huge jump in the state budget deficit but also contributed to the emergence of new stable mafia structures and a rapid buildup of shadow capital. The authorization for the cooperatives and joint ventures to engage in unsupervised foreign trade, given nonconvertibility of the ruble, domestic prices artificially low in comparison with world prices, and the presence of large amounts of shadow capital, led to speculation in national property.

A real threat to the economic security of the USSR has arisen on account of the growing amounts of contraband supplies of import commodities; unprocessed raw material exports; machinations involving the redistribution to the cooperatives and joint ventures of various accumulated products and raw material to the detriment of government commissions; their sale of nondisposable items accumulated at state enterprises everywhere for export overseas; illegal imports and exports of sums of capital without the actual organization of joint works, which is leading to the accumulation in joint-venture accounts of large sums of Soviet money, which are being exchanged for foreign currency at the black market price.

There has been an increase in the organized nature of crime in the financial and banking system by way of monetary machinations, the forgery of bank checks and credit cards, and illegal transactions involving the withdrawal and transfer of sums of money.

Such a situation may be seen as a variety of **financial war** against the USSR with the use of various forms of fraud, fictitious bankruptcy, and tax evasion.

Organized crime's control of the drug trade, prostitution, extortion (racketeering), and gambling has been tightened.

Instances of organized crime trading in transplant organs and donated blood have already been noted, and a black market in manpower is taking shape.

General crime and attacks on means of transportation—to which the forced stoppages in the operation of transportation, blockades of the highways, the mass "abandonment" of trains on open lines without protection, and the crowding of unguarded rolling stock with valuable freight at border stations and commercial seaports are contributing—have assumed catastrophic proportions.

The basis of many criminal actions is corruption, the essence of which is composed of bribery and the sale of official powers to various criminal communities, officials' use of their position for mercenary ends, bribery, graft, and state racketeering. With the aid of bribers, contracts are concluded with foreign companies, disadvantageous to the country, for supplies of substandard products and strategic raw material, and intermediate products are sold.

The current situation may be characterized as **a breakdown of restructuring processes in the sphere of the assurance of law and order:**

First, in the course of perestroyka it has not been possible to realize in practice the slogan to the effect that "there must with us be no criticism-free zones." A number of regions have not been touched by the cleansing process of the fight against organized crime and corruption. The processes uncovered in Uzbekistan have occurred in parallel in all republics, krays, and oblasts with a varying degree of intensity. The scope of the mafia structures has been manifestly underestimated: All sectors of the national economy and all elements of power have been infected with them.

Second, the system of law enforcement authorities, particularly the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], has been shaken under the widely heralded sovereignization.

Third, the misunderstood principle of humanization of the legal system has against the background of truly necessary measures pertaining to the rehabilitation of innocent sufferers led to a campaign for the rehabilitation of active criminals proceeding apace. A campaign to compromise and discredit employees of the militia and state security and prosecuting counsel who have honestly done their duty has developed against the background of the measures to shore up legality. This could not have failed to have influenced their general apathy and lack of faith in justice.

Fourth, the incessant reorganizations in the MVD throughout the years of perestroyka and the "darting" of the vast system now to one side, now to the other have taken an extremely negative toll on the effectiveness of the fight against crime.

As a result of these and a number of other factors perestroyka in the sphere of law and order has resulted in an orgy of crime. Unless the flywheel of realization of the slogan concerning the conversion of shadow capital and legalization of the shadow economy is stopped, these factors will all together against the background of the coming unemployment, centrifugal processes, explosion of ethnic, religious and political conflicts, and total shortages and against the background of the disintegration of the law enforcement system bring about a crime wave that will sweep aside all efforts to combat it.

The mechanism of the assurance of national security in the period of stabilization presupposes the elaboration of a system of the protection of economic activity against criminalization, structures of administration against corruption, and the public and society as a whole against an orgy of crime.

Society's Protection Against Organized Crime

The stage-by-stage creation of a strong presidential department for combating organized crime is envisaged in the organizational respect. At the first stage (over the next one and a half to two years) ramified, well-equipped structures at the regional and interregional levels subordinate to the corresponding centralized departments in the USSR MVD, USSR KGB, and USSR Procuracy will be created. At the second stage the structures that have been formed will unite in a single centralized department for fighting organized crime (a committee) directly subordinate to the president of the USSR. A security technical support office and an expert advisory system on a contract basis (per sector of the economy and structure of economic and legal activity) will be formed under the auspices of this department.

A law on the principles of fighting organized crime in the USSR (by analogy with the corresponding acts in the United States, Japan, Italy, and other countries) will be drawn up in the sphere of legal regulation. It is necessary simultaneously to bring criminal, civil, labor, financial, and other legislation of the USSR into line with the provisions of this all-Union law.

A strengthening of the USSR State Tax Inspection and its endowment with supervisory functions and competent authority and the right to investigate instances of the concealment of income and forward the material on such infringements to a court of law is envisaged.

A comprehensive program for monitoring the parameters of the shadow economy with the output of data in the USSR State Committee for Statistics by way of the formation of a uniform data base on these phenomena is being drawn up.

Protection of the Economy Against Criminalization

A single auditing body will be created under the auspices of the USSR Cabinet for inspections and audits at the behest and in accordance with the decisions of the law enforcement and financial authorities.

A system of regular checks of compliance with the procedure of banks' extension of credit to cooperatives, joint ventures, and joint-stock companies for the purpose of monitoring the use of the credit as intended and its return will be introduced.

The network of secondhand and commission stores for trading in merchandise which citizens have brought back from overseas with state and public supervision of their sale to the populace will be expanded.

A network of state-run commercial stores trading in items in short supply will be opened.

A flexible system of taxation (sales tax, profits tax) in respect of commercial stores opened by cooperatives and private individuals will be created.

A law on bankruptcy in the USSR, which will contain a mechanism of society's protection against embezzlement by way of bankruptcy, will be enacted.

An electronic system for tracking arbitration practice of the application of legislation governing the material liability of state-owned enterprises, organizations, cooperatives, joint ventures, and other legal entities for damage caused to their partners in business activity as a result of failure to comply with contractual commitments will be introduced.

The same system will be introduced to monitor the receipt, shipment, storage, and distribution of freight entering the USSR from abroad for the purpose of ascertaining and curtailing instances of its concealment, embezzlement, spoilage, and destruction.

A uniform all-state system of the accounting of the extent of losses of freight at all shipment stations for determining the actual areas of their occurrence and also delineating the personal responsibility of the participants in the transportation process, is being devised.

A list of foreign exchange valuables, dealings in which constitute a state monopoly (precious metals, gems, and minerals, except for jewelry, and also pieces of such items), will be established.

Protection of the USSR's Economic Security

A new mechanism of the functioning of all-around currency and customs control of foreign trade deals based on the information exchange and organizational interaction of the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Gosbank, commercial banks authorized to service payments pertaining to foreign trade deals and operating on the basis of licenses issued by the USSR Gosbank, the USSR Cabinet State Customs Control Main Administration, and the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Relations will be created.

A special currency and customs control authority equipped with modern computers making it possible to obtain and process data received from the exporter and importer organizations, the customs house, and the bank will be created to perform this work. A joint computer base in the customs authorities and the bank and, possibly, in the organizations presenting the accounting reports and also the elaboration of a common data base will be required in this case.

An expert customs appraisal department, which will incorporate a system of the machine tracking of exports of strategic raw materials and intermediate products and precious metals and imports of high-technology items from abroad, will be created. A procedure whereby imports and exports of products will be issued licenses only given certificates of appraisal of this department will be introduced.

A state monopoly on imports of particularly profitable foreign products (personal computers, home electronics, automobiles, audiovisual equipment, and so forth) will be declared.

A flexible tax policy for exports of energy, metals, construction materials, industrial raw materials, and particularly science-intensive technology will be devised. A special body will be formed under the auspices of the USSR Cabinet for this purpose.

The institution of legal and financial responsibility for the concealment of information pertaining to transactions via foreign banks to the detriment of the country's economic security will be introduced.

A network of foreign currency buying and selling desks in state bank and commercial bank branches, which will be granted this right by the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Relations, will be created.

Protection of Structures of Administration Against Corruption

The pivotal feature here is the adoption of principles of legislation of the USSR and the Union republics on the civil service, which will regulate questions of preventing civil servants from holding more than one job (other than research, invention, pedagogical, and expert-witness activity), acquiring gifts and accepting services from enterprises, establishments, and organizations and also from citizens in connection with the exercise of their official activity which might be construed as using their position for personal ends, and other deeds contributing to corruption.

Regulations will be prepared simultaneously on financial control of the property status of persons holding responsible state office providing for a declaration of valuable property they possess upon assumption of the office, as will a special procedure of their conclusion of major property deals.

Protection of Society Against Mass Criminal Manifestations

Additions to the USSR Law "On Legal Treatment of a State of Emergency" of 30 April 1990, the essence of which amounts to the creation of legal safeguards for the actual prevention of mass unrest in the "threat" period phase, when the unrest as such has yet to begin but when intensive preparations for it are under way, rumors are spreading, propaganda of interethnic discord is being conducted at mass meetings, and terrorist acts, sabotage, and acts of treachery are being perpetrated, will be made.

The decree of the president of the USSR dated 25 July 1990 "Prohibition of the Creation of Armed Formations Not Provided for by USSR Legislation and the Confiscation of Weapons in the Event of Their Illegal Storage" will be supplemented by a section on the imposition of a state of emergency in individual regions when it is necessary to disarm militarized groupings.

The USSR Laws "On Combating Terrorism," "On the Settlement of Armed Conflicts Between Republics," "On the Status of Refugees," and "On Responsibility for Genocide" will be drawn up and enacted.

The system of centralized leadership of the operational-search and investigatory staffs in the system of the internal affairs authorities will be restored. A "rapid deployment force" for interethnic conflicts and acts of mass unlawful extremism and terrorism will be formed under the auspices of the USSR MVD.

2.6. Contours of the Economy of the Future

On the threshold of the 21st century the country must escape from the socioeconomic crisis. The potential of this escape will either be wasted today or recreated for future economic growth. The "No Other Way" slogan could be adopted in this sense.

For this potential to develop it is necessary to diversify the socioeconomic system and make the economy, in which different forms of ownership compete between themselves and complement one another, multidimensional. It is the diversity of the economic space that will ensure the high probability of the emergence of poles of growth and boost the structural reorganization of the economy and technological modernization.

The opinion that only the market is capable of scarifying the soil for further economic growth is naive. An inertial and powerful industrial system buttressed by a administrative-command management mechanism self-sufficient for certain historical eras was created in the past. Only the state is capable of accomplishing serious structural changes and a modernization process under our specific conditions. It alone is capable of preparing our economy for efficient multidimensionality, when market methods of regulation are organically combined with state administration. It should be emphasized that without the perestroyka begun in 1985 the creation of a multidimensional economy would have been impossible. Nor would a transition to economic methods of regulation of the economy have been possible.

In today's transitional situation the question of management and the forms of it with which the country will enter the 21st century is once again on the agenda. The new type of management provides for the separation of strictly state from economic management. With respect to the economy of the future this means that strategic problems of development, at the macroeconomic level, in the main, will fall within the jurisdiction of the state structures, whereas the economic structures will concentrate on the current tasks of the reproduction process.

Given this type of management, elements of the "command approach" on the part of the state, but in the form of economic regulation, are inevitable.

The economy of the future presupposes openness to the world and will function as a multidimensional economy under state protectionism.

New social structuring will emerge. At some stage of our society's past historical development the class characterization of man's affiliation disappeared. A certain social community has actually been formed in our country. Now a so-called middle class is coming into being, and a sharp stratification of intra-class groups is emerging.

The economy of the future, as we see it, will not recognize social distinctions, and all members of society will be for it socially equal. Our political and socioeconomic space must afford all social groups and the people constituting these groups equal opportunities, conveniences and acceptability. The advantages of such social mobility will be preserved and developed. The primacy of values common to all mankind proclaimed by perestroyka will be realized in this sense.

A characteristic feature of the economy of the future is that a decisive role therein will be performed by the S&T intelligentsia. This is an objective process brought about, inter alia, by the specifics of labor in a modernized economy.

Thus the economy of the future is seen as being multidimensional, with a simplified production outline and modernized technology, socially focused and controlled predominantly by economic methods, with a developed multi-functional infrastructure, balanced in terms of financial and material flows and catering for the set of reasonable requirements of each member of society.

The country possesses every opportunity for realizing the strategy of a "breakthrough" economy.

Conclusion: Concept of the Breakthrough and the Post-Industrial Society

There is still no possibility at this time of clearly imagining the type of civilization which may be built as a result of the breakthrough. It may be outlined in negative assertions. It will not be a consumer society, it will not be an anti-ecological (in the broad meaning of the word including the ecology of culture and man) atomized society, it will not be an authoritarian and unitary bureaucratized regime and so forth.

But where is the opportunity to evolve toward such a society from a stage in which the survival of the nations is in question? And how can we speak about such a breakthrough when considerable numbers of the population live and think in the structures of the traditional, "slow" society and have not been thoroughly cooked in the pot of the market economy and the industrial way of life?

In our view, it is at the present stage of the development of human civilization that we have acquired this fortunate opportunity. And it amounts to the fact that at this historical moment three dialectically mutually rejecting types of civilization coexist: the traditional agrarian society, industrial civilization, and the post- industrial society. What opportunities does this combination afford for the USSR?

To accomplish the breakthrough it is undoubtedly necessary to complete the country's industrialization and to master a new stage in the science and technology revolution. This may be achieved only within the framework of a mixed economy with strong state participation and planning, the concentration of resources and an aggressive policy of innovation. But this system can only be efficient if it is confined to a comparatively compact "breakthrough zone." Given an attempt to extend the influence of plan mechanisms to an economic space increasingly vast in terms of scale and complexity, the system will once again misfire. The bulk of production and distribution should be switched to a self- organization mode. Even recently the sole possible mechanism for such self-organization essentially was the market. Its total organizing influence is being suggested as the mechanism by liberal democrats even now. Yet this is now no longer the sole alternative to planning. Systems of the post-industrial society which have overcome the totalitarianism of the market as an organizing mechanism have emerged and been put to the test in a number of different cultures in the world. These systems may be appended to regions where a "pre-market" society is predominant.

It is thus a question **of the use in the social sphere of the "tunnel effect,"** which is well known in technology. Mastery of elements of the post-industrial society and its characteristic modes of production and distribution without pulverizing the population in a market economy, people's "atomization," and a painful break with their cultural principles and world perception is now becoming possible. What the tired industrial society creates in response to the crisis of market relations may be organically perceived by the traditional society. This has been shown by the development trajectory of Japan, and in recent years, by that of a number of Southeast Asian countries. There is every prerequisite for this, for example, in the rural areas and small towns of Russia, Central Asia, and Kazakhstan and the North Caucasus.

The result of implementing this "tunnel effect" will be the assimilation by the population of given regions of the science-intensive, but **operationally simple** technology created by post-industrialism. This will produce a considerable increase in the productiveness of social and individual labor without its conversion to industrial labor. This will be the production of non-material-intensive and non-energy-intensive products for the satisfaction of personal requirements and extra-market exchange in town and country.

Through such technology part of the population will become involved in small-scale commodity family production with work in the home through a symbiosis with industrial enterprises. A large-scale and elastic system of jobs will be created and tremendous slumbering labor and intellectual resources will be mobilized, including the healthy participation in the family labor process of adolescents and old people, without large-scale capital investments. Even now post-industrial science has created a vast and rapidly expanding set of technologies which could perfectly well be assimilated by the population of the USSR and which could enhance the quality of its life and "denationalize" the production and consumption of massive parts of the social organism. Having established in addition to the conservative collectivist structures of the traditional society which exist currently a "second prop" in the form of the structures of post-industrialism, we will have sharply facilitated and accelerated the completion of building the elements of the developed industrial civilization in the niche between these props. And this activity will lend itself entirely to rational modern planning in combination with the market mechanisms of regulation. And the substantial numbers of the population which have already attained to the mentality and world perception of industrialism will avoid antagonistic clashes with the "sluggish" part of the population. The way to a healthy pluralist ecosystem of society will open before us.

The program study was prepared by a team of authors consisting of:
Leader S. Kurginyan, president of the Experimental Creative Center (ETTs) corporation, candidate of physico-mathematical sciences; candidate of Economic Sciences G. Avrekh, head of a laboratory of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Market Problems; candidate of Chemical Sciences T. Ayzatulin, senior

scientific associate of the State Committee for Science and Technology All-Union Scientific and Technical Information Institute and the USSR Academy of Sciences; P. Goncharov, chairman of the board of a bank; Candidate of Psychological Sciences Yu. Gromyko, head of a laboratory of the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Public Education Administration, Economics, and Development Institute; Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Gudkov, deputy director of the ETTs Systems Analysis Research Bureau; Doctor of Chemical Sciences S. Kara-Murza, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Socioeconomic and Scientific and Technological Development Analysis Center; A. Kondyrev, dean of the ETTs Methodological University; Candidate of Legal Sciences V. Ovchinskiy, head of a department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs All-Union Research Institute.

TASS Reviews Central Press for 17 Apr

LD1704065491 Moscow TASS in English 0637 GMT 17 Apr 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 17 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Japan, the first one in the history of bilateral relations. The visit began on Tuesday.

Newspapers carry reports, illustrated with photographs, on the president's arrival in Tokyo and an official welcoming ceremony for the distinguished Soviet guest in Akasaka Palace, the official residence assigned to him. Over there, Gorbachev and his wife were greeted by Akihito, the emperor of Japan, and Empress Michiko.

The emperor of Japan and the president of the USSR then headed for the Imperial Palace where they had a conversation.

The press reports the first round of Soviet-Japanese top-level talks held later in the day, with the Soviet president and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu discussing the state of and prospects for bilateral relations and problems concerning a peace treaty between the USSR and Japan. They emphasised mutual resolve to radically improve relations between the two countries and lay foundations for friendship.

Newspapers report a dinner given on Tuesday by the emperor of Japan in honour of the Soviet president. At the dinner, the Japanese monarch and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged brief speeches, the texts of which are published in PRAVDA.

While covering in detail the first day of the Soviet president's visit to Japan, the press points to well-wishing and friendliness marking the events of the day and mutual interest and openness characteristic of top-level meetings and talks.

Newspapers report ordinary Japanese people's genuine interest in the Soviet president's visit and their expectations that the visit will become a turning point in bilateral relations.

"The First Day of the Visit: A Good Start" is the headline of a report in PRAVDA which points out in particular that "a step towards mutual understanding has already been made."

Informing readers about the Tuesday proceedings at the Soviet parliament session, the press reports that the Soviet parliament at a closed-door meeting of the two parliamentary chambers adopted the first reading of amendments to the law on collective labour disputes.

The amendments envisage in particular a ban on political strikes in the country. The endorsed bill "shall not be retroactive" and is provided for by the government's anti-crisis programme. The second reading of the document will be considered simultaneously with the discussion of the anti-crisis programme in parliament next week.

The Soviet parliament also passed a resolution urging republican parliaments to immediately assign plenipotentiary representatives to set up an interparliamentary commission which should decide on the strikes issue and on ways leading out of strikes.

Deputies pointed out that a delay in the formation of an interparliamentary commission and postponement of the start of its work brings the Soviet economy closely to the line beyond which an irreversible process of disintegration would begin.

The parliament adopted a law on general principles for a state youth policy. Under the provisions of this legal act, the youth policy will be based on the principles of guaranteed provision of social services concerning education and vocational training to young citizens.

The law establishes a system of measures for economic, organisational and legal support for the entrepreneurial activities of young citizens, including easy-term credit-lending and taxation.

On the occasion of the 121st anniversary of the birth of Vladimir I. Lenin, PRAVDA carries an article headlined "He was an Intellectual Aristocrat". The article includes excerpts from a book of Bertrand Russell, a prominent British scientist and public figure, about his meeting with Lenin in Moscow in 1920.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper carries an interview with Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, who outlined the main tasks of the forthcoming plenum of the Party's Central Committee on April 24.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper continues to acquaint readers with the basic provisions of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' action programme to take the country's economy out of the crisis.

Reporting the continuing strike of coal miners, the press states that the consequences of the strike are felt more and more keenly in diverse branches of the country's economy.

PRAVDA points out in particular that, according to the USSR ministry of the automobile and agricultural machinery building, in the first quarter of the current year the sector experienced a shortfall of 93,000 tonnes of pig iron, 52,000 tonnes of coke, which led to the underfulfilment of the foundry iron casting plan—with a shortage of 160,000 tonnes. This means that there will be a delay in the manufacture of 57,000 trucks of various brands, 3,500 tractors and 4,000 harvesters, without which the sowing campaign would be in jeopardy.

Losses are also being incurred by metallurgy. There was a shortfall of 10,000 tonnes of cast iron at the Kuznetsk metallurgical mill in April. Only one blast furnace out of five is casting iron at the Chelyabinsk mill. The converter shop and seven rolling mills have been brought to a standstill.

Newspapers note that the situation in Transcaucasia remains extremely strained. Tension in Nagorno-Karabakh and South Ossetia is keeping on.

Some details of the work of the 47th session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission are given in an article by PRAVDA's special correspondent V. Bolshakov from Geneva.

Reports on the situation in Iraq and around it are leading international topics in newspapers. The press reports in detail measures being taken by the world community and individual states to give help to hundreds of thousands of Kurdish refugees who crossed into Iran and Turkey, fleeing from reprisals by the army of the Iraqi regime.

Economic

Further Reportage on Mine Strikes, Results

Raspadskaya Mine Ends Strike

LD1704085491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0720 GMT 17 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Excerpts] Kemerovo (Western Siberia), 18 Apr (TASS)-—The strike that started in March at Raspadskaya mine, the largest in the country, has been suspended and the enterprise today began normal work on extracting fuel—20,000 tonnes of coal per day. The labor collective decided to suspend the strike after a protocol was signed with the Russian Government on transferring Raspadskaya mine, formerly a leasehold enterprise under the USSR Ministry of Coal Industry, to the jurisdiction of the republic. [passage omitted] Tomorrow, Raspadskaya will start shipping coal to consumers. The miners' first task is to make up the losses resulting from the strike. Amounting to 30 million rubles, these are not insignificant losses.

In the Kuzbass as a whole, the situation remains tense. Over 50 coal mining enterprises, including 46 mines out of 76, are not working today. Other enterprises are holding rallies and meetings to discuss the decision by the Kuzbass strike committee council that collectives supporting the miners' demands should join the strike.

'Complete' Collapse Possible

LD1604164891 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By TASS observer Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow April 16 TASS—The Soviet economy lost 1,169,000 man-days as a result of strikes in March. A total of 542 enterprises were on strike, including more than 100 mines which account for the bulk of the losses. No summarised April data are available but the situation continues to worsen.

Here is a break-down of losses sustained by the economy. The Vorkutaugol Coal Mining Association, where 12 out of 13 mines are still on strike, failed to deliver nearly 600,000 tonnes of coal in March. As a result, emergency conservation measures have to be taken at a number of mines, and many kindergartens will have to be closed.

In Kuzbass in Western Siberia four major opencast mines and 45 out of 76 underground mines had stopped operations by April 12. Coal miners owe more than 800,000 tonnes of coal to metallurgists and even more to other clients.

In April, the slump rate in the industry is twice as high as in March. The miners' strikes have affected the work of metallurgical, machine-building and chemical plants and of agriculture as well. The Novolipetsk metallurgical plant is unable to continue to produce coking coal because of the disruption in raw material supplies. Coking ovens are breaking down and will take years to be restarted.

Of five smelting furnaces at the Chelyabinsk metallurgical plant only one continues smelting pig iron. The converter shop is at a standstill, seven rolling mills have stopped, and coking ovens are being put out of operation.

The plant is facing a full stop, ending metal supplies to more than 5,000 customers.

According to government estimates the country is due to lose at least five million tonnes of rolled stock. This will affect every branch of the economy, including agriculture. Spare parts for agricultural machines are especially unavailable now, at the height of spring field work.

The present crisis further exacerbates problems that remain from last year. In 1990, a total of 1,800 enterprises and organisations were on strike, and the losses of work time exceeded ten million man-days.

Socio-political conflicts caused the direct loss of products worth nearly one billion rubles.

In short, if strikes continue in response to some calls, we shall face a complete collapse.

'Only Losers' From Strike Losses

LD1604171991 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 16 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Direct production losses caused by strikes in March amount to 218 million rubles [R]. Complete data for April is not available but one can imagine the scale. After all the situation in the country is deteriorating. For example, losses at the Vorkutaugol association have exceeded R 700,000 while the Kuzbass miners' debt to metallurgy workers has exceeded R 800,000 and is even greater where other consumers are concerned. So, to all appearances, the situation is at a dead end but there will be no winners, only losers.

Sverdlovsk TU Calls for Warning Political Strike

PM1604115791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 p 1

[Correspondent V. Sanatin report: "Sverdlovsk: More of the Same"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk—One enterprise after another in Sverdlovsk Oblast is adopting the striking miners' political demands and siding with them.

A general warning political strike has been announced for 18 April, from 1200 through 1400 hours. People will attend rallies in the oblast's major political centers, such as Severouralsk and Nizhniy Tagil.

The council of chairmen of primary trade union organizations at metallurgical and mining enterprises has urged the oblast's working people to hold a general political strike. This call is backed by 53 labor collectives and hundreds of thousands of workers and employees. The following appeal has been adopted and is being disseminated by all kinds of media:

"To the metallurgists, miners, and all working people of Sverdlovsk Oblast.

"The collapse of the economy, the rapid drop in living standards, and the halting of metallurgical units and shops have led to extreme tension in labor collectives.

"Realizing the uselessness of demanding solutions to socioeconomic problems from the USSR president and Cabinet of Ministers and being convinced of their inability to extricate the country from the crisis, we fully support the demands of pitmen and Severouralsk miners with regard to the immediate resignation of the USSR president and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

"We urge Sverdlovsk Oblast metallurgists, miners, and all working people to hold a warning political strike in defense of these demands."

It is a fact that the trade union leaders have neither Communists, nor social democrats, nor the notorious "Yeltsin team" behind them. They have nothing behind them but ruin!

Jan-Mar Figures Reveal 'Unwelcome Trends'

PM1604151191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Article by V. Romanyuk under the "Statistics And Our Commentary" rubric: "Production Decline Continues In March"]

[Text] Here are the data for industry's work in the country in the first quarter of 1991: The overall fall in the volume of production compared with the corresponding period last year was 5 percent, in March—6 percent. It is the highest figure for the whole of last year and the beginning of this year.

V. Tolkushkin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, with whom I analyzed the statistical data, suggested departing from the traditional scheme and starting with coal extraction. Indeed, it is a problem that worries everyone. The quarterly figures do not yet suggest catastrophe: Coal extraction has fallen by 11 percent, including coking coal by 18 percent. But in March, when the strikes began, the picture became much worse: Total coal extraction fell by 18 percent, including coking coal by 32 percent.

How are things with the main coal consumers—the metallurgists? At the recent meeting between the miners and the government, I. Romazan, director of the Magnitogorsk metallurgical combine, said: Magnitka is on the verge of shutting down, and the Gorkiy truck plant, Kama truck plant, and many chemical and construction industry enterprises are not receiving metal. And that is only the tip of the iceberg. In the first quarter, production of rolled ferrous metals fell overall by 7 percent (9 in March). In April these figures will presumably increase—taking into account the batteries of coke ovens and the furnaces that have been shut down.

Generally speaking, some rather unwelcome trends are creeping in in the fuel and energy complex: We have a 1 percent increase in electricity generation and a 0.3 percent increase in gas production, but the rate of increase is steadily falling. The situation is even worse with the oil industry workers. Programs for resurrecting old deposits are not being fulfilled, indeed, many wells have been taken out of operation. During the quarter oil extraction fell by 9 percent (10 percent in March).

Throughout last year there was trouble in the chemical and timber complex. It continued to go downhill in the first quarter of 1991: Mineral fertilizer production was 8 percent down on the first quarter of 1990, production of chemical fibers and threads was 15 percent down, production of lumber was 15 percent down, and paper production was 6 percent down.

The hiccups in the machine building complex are becoming increasingly serious, although it was almost stable for the whole of last year. Evidently, the miners' strikes, via metallurgy, are beginning to affect the machine builders too, not only in volume terms, but in terms of separate items: 6 percent fewer metal-cutting lathes were manufactured, 9 percent fewer tractors, 14 percent fewer trucks, 13 percent fewer freight cars, and 10 percent fewer passenger cars. One of the main reasons one should mention is the severing of economic links.

Although we are already into the second quarter of the working year, the problem of economic contracts remains a topical one. By 20 February 1991, 86 percent of the economic contracts planned by enterprises for the supply of products had been concluded; by 18 March the figure was 88 percent (an increase of 2 percent over the month). As we can see, the very process of concluding economic contracts has gotten bogged down. It is also interesting that the implementation of contracts that have already been concluded is going badly, and contract discipline has declined. Some 43 percent of metallurgical complex enterprises have failed to cope with delivery commitments, with 44 percent in the case of the chemical and timber complex, 32 percent in the case of the fuel and energy complex, and 29 percent in the case of the machine building complex. But in most cases one can see a sequence of disruption. For example, the metallurgists lost twice as much working time in March as in February, which resulted in essential resources not being supplied on schedule.

But the most significant feature is that even given the failure to conclude all the contracts for the supply of products, the actual level of plans (intentions) for the year in industry was 10 percent down on last year (in comparable prices). This is a significant indicator of our business activity (or, rather, passivity and stagnation!) this year.

Delivery shortfalls for March reached 2 billion rubles [R]; R7.1 billion since the beginning of the year. That is around 2 percent of the total volume of production. If you compare this with the corresponding period last year, the delivery shortfall (in comparable prices) has increased by 50 percent. Moreover, the metallurgists' shortfall increased by 180 percent, that of enterprises in the fuel and energy complex increased by 130 percent, and that of enterprises in the chemical and timber complex increased by 80 percent.

On 1 January 1991 new fixed wholesale prices were introduced and the practice of using contract prices was considerably widened. The overall price level was 83 percent higher than last year. It was 84 percent higher for industrial-engineering goods and 80 percent higher (without the turnover tax) for consumer goods. It should be noted that there has been a larger increase in sectors which sell products at contract prices. There is some danger in this. If, say, the metallurgists acquire materials at contract prices and sell their products at fixed prices, then, in the end, the fixed price will "explode" under the pressure of contract prices. Then there will be nothing to prevent prices from soaring.

Union Budget Deficit Termed 'Catastrophic'

914A0628A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 16 Apr 91 p 1

[Interview with V. Kucherenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Budget, Planning, and Finance, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Captain Second Rank O. Odnokolenko; place and date not given: "Will the Military Get Their Pay Tomorrow?"]

[Text] **V. Kucherenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Budget, Planning, and Finance answers the questions of our correspondent.**

[Odnokolenko] Victor Grigoryevich, specialists call the current situation in the area of finance, credit, and monetary relations "catastrophic." Is this not something of an exaggeration? Perhaps, things are not that bad in our Fatherland?

[Kucherenko] Alas, this appraisal of the situation is correct. You probably remember that putting together a Union budget for this year was a far from simple task. In the end, the maximum allowable deficit of the Union budget was set at 26.7 billion rubles [R]. However, in the first quarter expenses have already exceeded income by R31.1 billion. Is this not ominous?

[Odnokolenko] Then what is the reason? Or have all the plants and factories in the country stopped and nobody is working anymore?

[Kucherenko] They have not stopped, but the decline in production is considerable—practically double what we expected. Thus the decline in the volume of profits and, accordingly, payments into the budget. But the main reason is an extremely unsatisfactory compliance with Union budget requirements. As is known, all republics, including the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, Georgia, and the Baltic Republics, signed an agreement on economic matters; unfortunately, far from everybody complies with it. Some republics, primarily the RSFSR, in contradiction to Union legislation, passed their own legislative acts in regard to the distribution of budgeted income collected on their territory. As a result, income from taxes on profits for the first two months of this year, for instance, fell by 72.4 percent in comparison with last year.

[Odnokolenko] Does this mean that our treasury is empty?

[Kucherenko] This is not the right word! We are already living in debt—we are consuming the wealth of our children. In other words, today we consume more than is considered prudent in any state that is thoughtful about its future. When we planned the distribution of our national income, we assumed that 13 percent would go into accumulation. But in reality we are consuming more—90 percent of our national income. The United

States, for instance, during the last 20 years has been putting aside 18 to 19 percent of national income for accumulation. Now, I think, it is clear what they leave to their children, and what we do. In essence, we are leaving a ruin to follow us.

[Odnokolenko] Your letter to the USSR president says that the main bulk of delinquencies in payments is the responsibility of the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and the Baltic Republics, but that payments from other republics also declined. Perhaps then the republic and local authorities will take upon themselves some of the expenses?

[Kucherenko] I have looked into this, and I can say that the situation in the Union republics is far from simple. Yes, income in republics' budgets increased by 2.3 times, but one has to know how to use these resources skillfully. Excessive expenditures, not justified by anything except political ambitions, have led to a very difficult situation. And what about the result of the price reform? When we were developing this program, we had an agreement that prices on some types of raw materials would remain on a certain level. Afterwards, it was planned to distribute the income in such a way that nobody would get hurt, so that there would not be a huge jump in prices on the final product, and so that they would not be increased for consumer goods. But some republics refused to share and kept everything for themselves. As a result, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Azerbaijan, which have fulfilled their obligations to [illegible]ntain prices on raw materials, have been left practically without any means. I can very well understand the representative from Uzbekistan who stood up at the session of the Federation Council and said that under these circumstances they would have to triple prices on cotton, gold, and so on. Where will this lead? The price of goods will increase not by a factor of 1.5 or 2, but tenfold!

[Odnokolenko] Do they not understand this in the republics, or in the localities? We are already half a step from an abyss...

[Kucherenko] Of course! I want to say once more: The situation is difficult. But it seems that there are politicians who are quite happy with it. It is obvious that much of what is being done is done intentional, that it is not only a result of dilettantism. The disintegration of the Union economy will be automatically followed by the disintegration of the Union itself. But, believe me, nobody will profit from this. I got the impression at the Federation Council that all leaders understand equally well what kind of tragedy may happen if we do not stop the so-called "war of laws" and mutual obligations are not fulfilled. It was said clearly: We have to stop pulling the blanket to our own side if we do not want--not in words but in deeds—to plunge the people into the abyss of financial chaos.

[Odnokolenko] Nevertheless, neither Georgia, nor the Baltics, nor some other republics are in a hurry to fulfill their obligations and pay up. This is another reason, as you point out in your letter to the USSR president, why the budget has no means to finance practically anything in the second quarter, including the national economy, the social sphere, maintaining the army, and implementing Chernobyl, Aral, and other programs.

[Kucherenko] Well, then we are simply forced to develop such steps that will allow us, for instance, to keep our books with the Baltic republic at world prices. What else can we do if they, while buying raw materials cheaply, have no desire to compensate for others' expenses? This will happen to any other republic that refuses to participate in the currently existing unified market.

In two to three years, of course, everything will be different. We will inevitably arrive at the stage where the situation in which we all find ourselves now simply will not have the chance to arise and there will be no need for redistribution. Everything will be regulated by market prices. Then it will become abundantly clear who feeds whom and who lives at whose expense.

[Odnokolenko] All right, Victor Grigoryevich, but let us for now assume the worst scenario. What will happen if we are not able to avoid chaos, if common sense does not prevail? Is it possible, in such a case, that a situation will arise in which there is no money to pay the military?

[Kucherenko] No, this situation cannot happen. We will simply print more money and pay with it. But it will be money with no goods to back it up. Then the military, as well as other citizens, will "accelerate" their search for goods in short supply, because at that time there will be two or more salaries chasing one pair shoes. In other words, first come, first served.

[Odnokolenko] But this is not going to bring any good. The avalanche of money, with nothing to buy with it, will simply become greater, while it does not seem that store shelves could possibly become emptier than they already are now.

[Kucherenko] Yes, of course, increasing the money in circulation is enormously stupid—which is what we keep saying all the time. Is it not clear that all these strikes with the demand to increase salaries is suicide for the country? But look for yourself: We are simply forced to put the money-printing presses at full speed. Would this be necessary if the Union economy were not constantly undermined—by some on purpose, and by some through ignorance. In general, politics should follow the economy, not the other way around.

[Odnokolenko] Could it be that there is still some hope for saving our economy if each republic creates its own currency? These options are being quite seriously discussed.

[Kucherenko] We have to clearly understand that the emergence of republic currencies will immediately result in the disintegration of the country. Besides, will a republic's own money by itself add more goods to the market? At the same time, the disintegration of unified economic space would indeed take place. At this point nobody can even predict what the decline in production would be—by 50 percent or by a full 60 percent...

[Odnokolenko] In a few words, Victor Grigoryevich—does the price increase affect the well-being of the USSR people's deputies themselves? How are you doing here, behind the Kremlin wall?

[Kucherenko] Of course it affects us. Our salaries are fixed and they are not very high, while expenses grow in proportion to the rise in prices. For instance, a dinner at the Kremlin costs the same as in any workers cafeteria now—R3 to R4. You can go and see for yourself, and then we will compare notes...

USSR Law on Business Activity Published

914A0613A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Law signed by USSR President M. Gorbachev in Moscow on 2 April: "On the General Principles of Business Activity of Citizens in the USSR"; passages between slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] The present law determines the general principles of business activity in the USSR, regulates the rights and responsibility of subjects of business activity, provides for their state protection and support, and regulates relations between businessmen and state administrative organs.

The law is aimed at creating conditions for the broad manifestation of the economic initiative and enterprisingness of citizens based on the realization of the principle of equality of all forms of ownership and freedom to dispose of property and select spheres of activity.

Article 1. **Business Activity**

Business (business activity) is inventive, independent activity of citizens aimed at obtaining profit and personal income, conducted on their own behalf, at their own risk, and with their own property liability or on behalf of and with the property liability of a corporate body—an enterprise.

The businessman may conduct any kind of business activity that is not prohibited by legislative acts of the USSR and the Union republics, including commercial intermediary, trade-purchasing, innovative, consultative, and other activity, and also operations involving securities.

Article 2. **Legislation on Business Activity**

Relations related to business activity, regardless of the forms of ownership or kinds and spheres of activity, are regulated by the Fundamentals of Civil Legislation, the present law, and other legislative acts of the USSR and Union republics.

If to conduct business activity the businessman creates or acquires an enterprise which is a corporate body, its activity is also regulated by the USSR law "On Enterprises in the USSR" and other legislation on enterprises, since the present law does not prohibit this.

The peculiarities of business activity of foreign citizens, including for the acquisition of the property of state enterprise, are regulated also by legislation of the USSR and the Union republics on foreign investments on the territory of the USSR.

In relations where one of the parties is represented by foreign physical and corporate bodies, rules of the international treaty are applied if the latter establishes rules other than those contained in USSR legislation on questions of business activity.

Article 3. **Subjects of Business Activity**

Business activity may be engaged in by:
any USSR citizen with full rights according to the policy determined by legislative acts of the USSR and the republics;
any foreign citizen or person without citizenship, with the exception of cases stipulated by legislative acts of the USSR and the republics;
groups of citizens (partners)—collective of businessmen.

Business activity may not be engaged in by managers and specialists of state organs whose functions include resolving problems related to the performance of business activity or control of such activity.

Article 4. **Forms of Business Activity**

The forms of business activity are private business activity and collective business activity conducted by subjects of business activity on the basis of the property of citizens and also property obtained and used on a legal basis.

The state recognizes any forms of business activity conducted within the framework of the law as socially useful activity and provides legal guarantees and support for it.

Business activity may be carried out within the limits established by the USSR and the republics:
without the use of hired labor;
with the use of hired labor;
without the formation of a corporate body;
with the formation of a corporate body.

The main form of business activity is business activity conducted by the manager of an enterprise if he, under contract with the owner of the property of the enterprise or an individual (organ) authorized by him has been assigned the rights and duties and bears liability established for the business activity by the present law.

Article 5. **Rights of the Businessman**

The businessman has the right:
to create for conducting his activity any kinds of enterprises or organizations which do not contradict legislative acts of the USSR and the republics;

to acquire all or part of the state property of enterprises and enterprises based on other forms of ownership, other property, and property rights;

to participate with his property or property obtained on a legal basis in the activity of other business subjects;

to use property of corporate bodies or citizens with the consent of these parties;

to hire and fire workers under conditions of a contract and other conditions established by legislation;

to independently establish forms, systems, and amounts of wages and other kinds of incomes for hired workers;

to independently form a program of economic activity, to select suppliers and consumers of the products (goods, services) that are produced, and to perform work and deliveries for state needs on a contractual basis;

to establish prices and rates in keeping with legislative acts of the USSR and republics;

to open bank accounts for saving money and conducting all kinds of accounting, credit, and cash operations;

to freely dispose of profit (income) from business activity remaining after paying taxes and making other mandatory payments. When business activity is conducted on the basis of a contract, the policy for distributing profit is regulated by the contract;

to obtain any amount of personal income without limit;

to use the state social security and social insurance system in keeping with the policy established by law;

to appeal, in keeping with the established procedure, actions of state and other organs that encroach upon his rights or legitimate interests;

to act as a participant in foreign economic relations in keeping with the policy established by legislation for corporate bodies;

to conduct currency operations in keeping with the policy established by the USSR law "On Currency Regulation."

Article 6. **Duties and Responsibility of the Entrepreneur**

The businessman is obliged:

to conclude agreements (contracts) with citizens who are hired and also, if necessary, collective agreements with trade unions acting on behalf of labor collectives in keeping with legislation of the USSR and the republics. The businessman does not have the right to prevent hired workers from joining trade unions to protect their socioeconomic interests;

to pay wages to hired workers at a level not below the minimum amounts established by legislative acts of the USSR and the republics;

to deposit into the state social insurance fund deductions for hired workers according to the procedure and in the amounts established by legislation of the USSR and the republics;

to provide working conditions for hired workers that correspond to legislation and agreements (contracts) that have been concluded;

to take measures to ensure ecological safety, protection of workers, technical safety, industrial hygiene, and sanitation, guided by existing provisions and norms;

to observe the rights and legitimate interests of the consumers and ensure the proper quality of goods (work, services) that are produced;

to obtain special permission (license) for activity in spheres that are subject to licensing in keeping with legislation of the USSR and the republics.

The businessman who conducts his activity without forming a corporate body is responsible for the obligations related to this activity with all of his property except the property which, in keeping with legislative acts of the republics, is not subject to penalties.

The businessman who conducts his activity on the basis of a contract is responsible for the obligations of the enterprise of which he is in charge with all of his property except property which, in keeping with legislative acts of the republics, is not subject to penalties. He bears the same kind of liability for failure to fulfill or improper fulfillment of obligations ensuing from the contract.

Article 7. **State Registration of Citizens Engaged in Business Activity Without Forming a Corporate Body**

State registration of citizens engaged in business activity without the formation of a corporate body is conducted according to the procedure determined by legislation of the USSR and the republics.

Article 8. **Halting of Business Activity**

Business activity is halted by a decision of the court or the businessman.

Business activity is halted by a decision of the court in the following cases:

declaration of bankruptcy by the businessman;

repeated or gross violation of legislation;

the performance of business activity that is prohibited or activity that requires special permission (license) when such permission has not been granted;

violation of ecological safety norms;

other grounds stipulated by legislative acts of the republics.

The court that made the decision to halt the business activity in cases established by the present article determines the procedure and time periods for halting the business activity in keeping with legislative acts of the USSR and the republics.

In the event of the death of the businessman, his rights and responsibilities for conducting business activity are transferred to his heirs.

Business activity conducted on the basis of a contract may be halted upon expiration of this contract or its dissolution at the request of one of the parties in cases and according to the procedure stipulated by the contract.

Article 9. **Taxation of Profit From Business Activity and the Private Income of the Entrepreneur**

Taxation of the profit from business activity conducted with the formation of a corporate body is carried out according to the procedure established for taxation of enterprises established by the USSR law "On Taxes on Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations." Taxation of the private income of the businessman in this case is carried out according to the procedure established by the USSR law "On Income Tax from USSR Citizens, Foreign Citizens, and Individuals Without Citizenship."

Article 10. **State Support for Business Activity**

The state guarantees observance of the rights and legitimate interests of the businessman, creates conditions for free conscientious competition of businessmen, and provides for them equal opportunities for access to material-substantial, financial, labor, informational, and natural resources, by preventing monopolies on the markets for these resources.

To increase the effectiveness and extensively spread business activity, the state creates conditions for direct support for business activity, including informational, consultative, scientific, and study centers and also innovation and insurance funds.

Article 11. **Protection of the Rights of Businessmen**

If as a result of the publication by the state or some other organ of an act that is not in keeping with its authority or the requirements of legislation, or the rights of the businessman are violated, he has the right to appeal to the court to declare this act invalid.

Losses caused to a businessman, including missed opportunities, as a result of following orders from state or other organs or their officials which violated the rights of the businessman, and also as a result of improper performance by these organs or officials of duties as stipulated by legislation regarding the businessman are subject to reimbursement by these organs.

Disputes concerning reimbursement for losses are resolved by the court.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, USSR president
Moscow, The Kremlin, 2 April 1991

Enabling Decree

914A0613B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Decree signed by A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in Moscow on 4 April: "On Enacting the USSR Law 'On General Principles of Business Activity of USSR Citizens'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To enact the USSR law "On General Principles of Business Activity of Citizens in the USSR" from the moment of its publication.

2. Legislative acts in effect that to not contradict the given law are to be applied until legislation of the USSR and the republics is brought into line with the USSR law "On General Principles of Business Activity of USSR Citizens."

3. In the future until the adoption by the republics of legislation concerning the procedure for state registration of businessmen conducting their activity without the formation of a corporate body, this registration will be carried out without exacting payment by executive committees of rayon, city, and rayon- in-city soviets of people's deputies in the place of residence of the businessman, in keeping with the temporary policy approved by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

4. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is to submit for the consideration of the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals concerning bringing USSR legislative acts in line with the USSR law "On Basic Principles of Business Activity of USSR Citizens";
before 1 June 1991 to bring decrees and instructions of the USSR Government in line with the aforementioned law;
before 1 June 1991 to provide for the revision and abolition by USSR ministries and departments of their normative acts that contradict the aforementioned law;
before 1 January 1992 to develop an all-Union program for contributing to the development of business activity of citizens, envisioning in it, in particular, measures of state support for those kinds of business activity which are aimed at improving protection of the health of the population, increasing ecological safety and protecting the environment, and increasing the production of food products and consumer goods;
before 1 June 1991 to analyze the course of the implementation of the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers of 8 August 1990 No. 790 "On Measures for Creating and Developing Small Enterprises" and take the necessary measures on the basis of this.

5. To declare invalid the USSR law of 19 November 1986 "On Individual Labor Activity" (VEDOMOSTI VERKHNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1986, No. 47, p. 964; 1988, No. 11, p. 174) from the time of the enactment of the USSR law "On General Principles of Business Activity of Citizens in the USSR."

Citizens conducting their activity on the basis of the USSR law "On Individual Labor Activity" should go through registration according to the procedure envisioned by the present decree before 1 January 1992. Patents and registration certificates issued to citizens on the basis and according to the procedure established by the USSR law, "On Individual Labor Activity," remain valid throughout 1991.

Point 2 of Article 19 and Articles 20 and 21 of this law apply to businessmen conducting their activity without forming a corporate body up until such time that changes are made in the USSR law "On Income Tax from USSR Citizens."

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
Moscow, the Kremlin, 4 April 1991

Details of Western Ruble Speculation Aired

91UF0628A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Mar 91 p 3

[Article by Candidate of Physics and Mathematical Science S. Kurginyan, Candidate of Judicial Science V. Ovchinskiy, and Candidate of Economic Science G. Avrekh: "Financial War, or One More Episode of the Secret Battle"; all names transliterated as published]

[Text] **...On the morning of 4 March, one of the authors received a telephone call at home. Diana Miller, general director of the joint British-Soviet enterprise Dynamic, asked for an urgent meeting on the occasion of publication of the article "Financial War" (MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 1 March 1991). We decided to meet with her, especially since the editors of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA had some questions for us after the publication of M. Berger's article in IZVESTIYA (28 February 1991). We entered D. Miller's office on Tsvetnoy Boulevard during the lunch break and left late in the evening. This is what we heard...**

Before we tell all of it, though, we want to warn the reader that all facts used in our article are presented in the Englishwoman's interpretation, and Diana Miller assumes all responsibility for them.

What the "Fax" Told

On 4 and 9 December 1990, SP [joint enterprise] Dynamic received by fax confidential letters from Daniel Lukach, president of the U.S. company La Mer International, addressed to Georgiy Ivanovich Makarenko, first deputy general director of the East-West Center for International Cooperation of the USSR Academy of Sciences (the fax is leased at the request of East-West). The letters were quite interesting. The subject was the exchange of 20 billion Soviet rubles [R] for U.S. dollars at the exchange rate of 20 to 1 (that is, at the "black market" rate). It also followed from the letters that the intended operation was not the last one. The deal was to be conducted through the Belgian bank Generale de Banque in Brussels.

D. Miller, suspecting something "fishy" in these deals, immediately started her own private investigation. Through her business partners abroad she found a man who is connected to this bank and is involved in buying Soviet rubles. This man turned out to be Raul Rolling, who, in his telephone conversation with D. Miller, said that he was ready to buy any multibillion amount of Soviet rubles (especially those that are already outside of the USSR) at prices higher than those at the "black market" inside the Soviet Union. R. Rolling named three large U.S. corporations that were involved in buying up rubles in enormous amounts: Coca-Cola, IBM, and ITT (by the way, ITT is known for its financial "participation" in the overthrow of Chilean President Salvador Allende in the fall of 1973).

At the same time, through her connections, D. Miller uncovered several more contacts for the same type of operation. She got acquainted with Portuguese businessman M.A. Foster (Phone number in Portugal 351-49-222. This and telephone numbers further on are from D. Miller's computer.—Author). M. Foster assured her that he had experience in currency operations with rubles: He had been shipping them via Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Paul Akera, D. Miller's first deputy, conducted negotiations with the Portuguese on the potential resale of rubles (he did it at her request following the line of private investigation). M. Foster confirmed to P. Akera that he was prepared to buy billions of rubles.

Then three more similar businessmen emerged: Canadian Claude Lapier (telephone in Canada 514-944-0673), American John Kent, representative of the Debiki [as transliterated] company. And J. Kent's acquaintance, an Al Barton (telephone 609-492-1358), who offered D. Miller a buy-out of Soviet rubles in any amount, but wanted a 15 percent commission "on profit."

Such was the "interesting" information that came to D. Miller in December 1990. She tried to find answers to questions that were plaguing her and spoke to various specialists in Moscow. At the same time, in December, the Englishwoman met for the first time with IZVESTIYA Economic Commentator M. Berger for a consultation. She told him of her impressions and conclusions. M. Berger gave her some advice, explained a few things, but for some reason did not tell the readers of his newspaper of the foreigner's doubts. Now he does not even mention his December meetings with D. Miller. One wonders—why?..

The Flying Roasting Pans

Something else is interesting. Why, for instance, did the journalist not tell the story of SP Dynamic in his article? Why did he limit himself to quoting D. Miller's comment: "...This SP brings more harm than good to your country..." And no explanations. Just a fragment of a phrase, taken out of the context of judgments and comments by the English businesswoman...

Well, then we will relate what D. Miller told us about her work experience in the British-Soviet SP. Especially considering that this story is directly related to the "financial war" topic.

Being one of the SP Dynamic founders, D. Miller naively believed that she would be able to set up an honest (not "dirty") joint business in the USSR. "So that both I and the country—the birthplace of my father—would profit." The plans called for searching for talented Soviet specialists in cybernetics and engineers-programmers, assistance in developing new computer systems, and the subsequent sale of the Soviet-developed technologies (as competitive goods) on the world market. Simultaneously, Diana was planning to get involved in the computerization programs for industrial production, business, and education in the USSR. So it was not beer barrels and garden spades—as M. Berger had presented it—that were in the Englishwoman's strategic plans.

Alas, those were the plans of only one side—D. Miller. Soviet partners were excited about something else: to "make money" in any way possible. And nothing else! In 1988, our heroine encountered the following situation. N. Poluyko, who was at that time Dynamic director, and his deputy M. Bondarenko, with the support of—in the Englishwoman's opinion—A. Morozov, deputy department head at the USSR Goskomizdat [State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade] (this organizations was one of Dynamic founders), turned the SP into an ordinary transit warehouse for very questionable operations involving purchase and resale to foreign countries of items in short supply (then and even more so now) such as aluminum and other metal cookware.

D. Miller showed us related documents. Our women, who have long suffered from shortages of everything, will probably be in a better position to comment on the "contribution" of Soviet "entrepreneurs" to the "improvement of living standards of the population." In a matter of just a few months they sold abroad 162 tons of aluminum cookware alone, purchased for next to nothing (for "wooden" rubles). This means tens of thousands of roasting pans, skillets, trivets, pots and pans, saucepans, wash stands and wash basins. And other goods listed in the documents. The main suppliers of these goods for Dynamic in 1988 were: Balashikha Casting and Mechanical Works; Roskhoztorg—Moscow interoblast wholesale enterprise for trading household and electric appliances and kitchenware; Metal and Household Goods Plant No. 6; and Bashkiria Rolled and Profile Iron Industrial Complex (in Ufa).

The mechanics of those deals were simple. In accordance with contract No. 62 dated 20 September 1988, Dynamic was buying metal kitchenware for the Russian republic association Rosattractsion, which, in turn, sold this kitchenware (or, rather, pure aluminum) to foreign partners through "its own" SP Aspect and some company called CSG International, Ltd. The latter of the abovementioned organizations was headed by an S. Chityan. He also was the de facto manager of Dynamic in 1988—although he was not directly linked to it, he used it as a "protege" of the already mentioned A. Morozov from Goskomizdat.

"The Iron Lady" From Tsvetnoy Boulevard

Having learned of these deals and of the strange transformations the SP she had founded was undergoing, Diana Miller brought up the question of the expediency (and morality!) of these activities. How naive! She was told that "computers (any!) are more needed in the USSR than skillets." And the computers were, as they say, present: Part of the hard currency proceeds from the sale of aluminum cookware "on the cheap" was spent on primitive computers and game machines that were immediately resold in the Soviet Union—again, at speculative prices. A familiar picture of turning consumer goods of basic necessity into both hard currency and rubles. But not for the people and not for the state. For whom? This is probably clear to everyone.

D. Miller is a person of action. She immediately demanded a stop to this kind of deals. She refused to sign already prepared contracts and scheduled a physical inventory. She started to get documentation in order (at that time the SP did not even keep the minutes of the board meetings). She passed part of the documentation on abuses over to 38 Petrovka Street and to the Department for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation of the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon Administration of Internal Affairs. She notified the State Committee on Publishing and the Consular Division of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the improprieties. She insisted on firing SP accountant Titova and conducted new elections to the board. She disbanded the whole "distinguished company" and took over the management of Dynamic herself.

Yes, the image of Diana Miller that emerges upon a personal encounter is quite different from the one created by M. Berger. By the way, this elderly woman had to act in the environment of desperate resistance from our domestic "partners-businessmen." They even tried to declare her "insane." They sent SP employee V. Semenov to England with the task of collecting compromising materials on her in London. Alas, he could not find anything. The wheeler-dealers ended up empty-handed. The "Iron Lady" on Tsvetnoy Boulevard has weathered all attacks. And won—so far. This is not, by the way, her only victory in the USSR. For instance, she stopped the attempts of the Leningrad Branch of Dynamic to make illegal deals involving the export from the USSR of a strategic product—rare metal germanium. The offer was very profitable—it came from an "expert" in such deals, Cambridge businessman John Middlemass who had been successfully exporting germanium from China.

What are Diana Miller's plans now? She wants to strengthen even more her cooperation with Academician Ye. Velikhov, whom she had helped in outfitting the Children's Computer Center (she donated a school system of six computers). She is burning with desire to participate in creating in the USSR a system of electronic tracking of currency and customs operations; and she is thinking about other projects as well.

...While we were talking to D. Miller in her office, there were many telephone calls, and many people stopped by. There was this strange man who walked in and offered to sell any amount of rubles. For dollars—at 1 to 40 exchange rate. There was a call from an acquaintance in London. He said he was again offered a chance to participate in a deal involving Soviet rubles.

Some Conclusions

First. You cannot hide a cat in a bag forever. The story about the currency operations did come out. And it seems that somebody will have to answer for it. Including some idols of our radicals. The main difference between radicalism, by the way, and any other political current is that it does not need its own programs or its own ideas—it simply takes the ideological luggage of its opponents and takes it to the extreme while adding its own coloration. For instance, instead of the celebrated slogan "Fulfill the Five-Year Plan in Three Years!" they come up with a "new" one—"A Market in 500 Days!" As to those who start to doubt it, the radicals simply "push them off the stage." How? There are quite a few ways to do it. And all of them were developed at times, so to say, preceding "the most current period." The discreditation techniques of the epoch of stagnation and Stalinism serve very well those who now advocate highbrow democratism.

Take, for instance, the "ANT [Automation, Science, and Technology] Affair." Remember? First it was used to discredit N.I. Ryzhkov. Then the same ANT was pronounced to be all but the savior of the country. All it took was renaming it—for the naive ones—into Rossiyskiy Dom. It is not our task to discuss the taste in choosing names, but we are slightly puzzled.... This was the name of the Soviet Union department in the British special services.

Second. The hidden spring of agitation around Prime Minister V. Pavlov's words about the financial war against the USSR became even more clear. Judge for yourself. Some members of the government of Russia are engaged in machinations: a billion goes there, a billion moves here. All of a sudden the head of the Union Government hits the "bull's eye." Then an idea is born that could be a match for the best samples of "gescheftmacher" [dealmaking] art: If the West stops extending credits (to Russia, for instance), the disaster in foreign economic relations can be blamed on Pavlov's official government statement instead of the sick heads of the machinators. This time, however, they have not been able to pull it off.

The 15 February 1991 report by the commission of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet deputies on the "contract on the sale of R140 billion" says unequivocally: "Its potential implementation would have created a threat to the stability of relations with Union republics, and would have destabilized the process of money circulation in the country... Concentration of such an amount of rubles in the hands of an unknown firm could have created the possibility of serious financial diversions both against individual republics and the USSR as a whole. Confidence toward the RSFSR Government on the part of large Western banks and firms has been undermined... Quite possibly there may be complications in getting credits from Western partners." This report is unequivocal in naming those at fault.

Third. It is not our intent to zero in on the questionable actions of the government of Russia as a root of all trouble. These are large operations, but the circle of those involved in carrying them out probably transcends the boundaries of Russia. For instance, from our conversation with D. Miller and the documents she supplied one can see that some subsidiary organization of the USSR Academy of Sciences was involved in this speculation. One can criticize the popular economists from the Academy of Sciences for many things, but nobody would argue that they would score the highest marks for their knowledge of the dollar exchange rate at the international "black market."

Fourth. In our article "Financial War" we presented brief descriptions of the different types of this phenomenon. The "dynamics of speculation" uncovered by D. Miller expands our understanding of this richly blooming sphere of "activities" in our country. Guesses that strategic resources are being pumped out of the country have been confirmed. Truly, when our newly converted movers and shakers start making deals for raw materials with the cunning "Hanseatic" traders—watch out. The truth is that the Western world (in the opinion of their own Western experts) has entered another "long sine" in the economic cycle. In the field of technology, this stage is accompanied by the "revolution of materials": Their assortment and quality sharply expand. Thus a need arises for "quality" raw materials. However, their extraction and processing involve considerable usage of energy and ecological damage. What then does the sale of the same aluminum cookware abroad—directly or through middlemen—mean? Trifles at first glance. But!.. The USSR uses raw materials imported for hard currency in aluminum production. In addition, to produce one ton of aluminum it uses nine tons of ideal fuel, including more than 17,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. In reality, this is what this aluminum cookware is—if we look at the expenditures. In the United States and Germany, however, about 30 percent of the aluminum is produced from "scrap" aluminum, that is, by smelting used aluminum items (including utensils and cookware, among others). They save both energy and money. And our domestic mover and shaker knows that the price of aluminum on the Western market is (wow!) between $1,500 and $2,000. So he plays on the price and exchange rate differentials.

So what, some will say, one SP sold 162 tons of aluminum abroad. But what if a hundred, or all SP's get into this? Unfortunately, many SP's are actively involved in exactly this business. What about the deal to sell germanium abroad—fortunately, never consummated? Germanium, without which the production of semiconductors (diodes, transistors, and photodiodes) is impossible? What kind of economic modernization can we talk about if we sell such materials abroad?

Fifth. All the latest events (the report of the Russian legislature's deputies commission and the meeting with Diana Miller) only reinforced our conviction: The financial war is being actively conducted in several directions. Therefore, a reliable control system on the part of Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the republics is needed. Perhaps, it is time to create special structures under the Cabinet of Ministers. The task is simple and uncompromising—to protect national wealth. It is in danger.

Military

'Great Power' Status Requires Retaining Kurils

AU1704071291 Paris AFP in English 0424 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 17 (AFP)—The Soviet Union could no longer be defined as a great power if it gave up four disputed strategic islands off northern Japan, the Soviet general in charge of the country's Far East has said here.

The statement by General Viktor Novoyilov, published by the unofficial INTERFAX news agency, came as President Mikhail Gorbachev was in Tokyo on the first ever visit to Japan by a Soviet leader, with the quarrel over the islands top of the agenda.

Gen. Novoyilov said the return of the four islands in the Kuril chain, seized by the Soviet Union from Japan at the end of World War II, would completely destroy the military balance in the Asia-Pacific region. "It would quite simply mean that the Soviet fleet would be immobilised," he said. "We could no longer call ourselves a great power."

The Soviet Union's main Far East military base and deep-water port is Vladivostok, whose only two practical outlets to the Pacific are north through the narrow La Perouse Strait between Japan and the Soviet island of Sakhalin and thence through the Kurils, or south between Japan and South Korea.

The four disputed islands give the Soviet Union a vantage point to control the southern approaches to the La Perouse Strait. Moscow's possession of the rest of the Kurils, which stretch across the southern edge of the Sea of Okhotsk to the Kamchatka Peninsula, is not at issue.

INTERFAX said that the Soviet military stressed that the United States and Japan together had a two-to-one advantage in terms of manpower, and a four-to-one edge in terms of large warships, over their forces in the region. The United States also had a major advantage thanks to its ship-launched cruise missiles with ranges of over 600 kilometres (350 miles).

General Staff Deputy Chief on Far East Balance

LD1504115191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[Interview with Colonel General V. Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, by V. Litovkin under the rubric "From Competent Sources"; place and date not given: "Do We Threaten Japan?" —first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The USSR president will make the first official visit to Japan in the history of relations between our countries in the next few days. Among the acute problems he will discuss with the country's leadership there will evidently be military ones too. What kind of problems are they, how does the USSR Ministry of Defense perceive them, and how is it proposed to resolve them?

Colonel General V. Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, answers our reporter's questions.

[Litovkin] As you know, Bronislav Aleksandrovich, one of the conditions for strengthening confidence between our countries is the Japanese side's proposal that we publish data on the Soviet military grouping in the Far East. What is included in this grouping?

[Omelichev] To be brief, the Soviet troops in the Far East incorporate two historically evolved groupings: One counters the U.S. and Japanese armed forces in the Pacific zone, as well as the U.S. troops in Alaska and on the U.S. West Coast. A considerable proportion of our troops is deployed on islands and peninsulas facing the Pacific. The other was set up in the past to cover the land borders east of the country and is located in the narrow, populated strip along the Soviet-Chinese border and close to industrial and administrative centers.

Now, specific figures. Until recently, the two groupings included 597,600 men. Their arsenal included 1,690 combat aircraft, approximately 12,600 tanks, 14,300 infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers, and approximately 16,400 artillery systems. The Pacific Fleet incorporated 55 large surface ships, including two aircraft carriers, and 48 nuclear-powered submarines, which tackle the region's defensive tasks. This does not include submarines with strategic ballistic missiles.

[Litovkin] Why do you speak of the groupings' composition in the past tense?

[Omelichev] Because, in the course of the unilateral reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces, the grouping of our troops in the Far East has been reduced by 120,000 men. Twelve divisions have been cut back in the Ground Forces, 11 air regiments have been disbanded, and 16 warships, including three large surface ships and seven submarines, have been removed from the fleet's combat composition. We now have fewer troops than South Korea, let us say, left in that region as a result of these reductions.

[Litovkin] Our grouping is earmarked for defense against the Japanese and U.S. forces deployed in the region. What kind of forces are they? How do are our defensive structures measure up against them?

[Omelichev] A small elaboration. I did not say that we "defend" ourselves against these forces. As military people, however, we cannot disregard their composition, structure... In short, their combat potential. This is as follows.

The United States has deployed within the region a powerful grouping which includes more than 530,000 men. It includes U.S. bases in Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, the Mariana and Hawaiin Islands, Alaska, and the U.S. West Coast. These forces have in their arsenal approximately 250 nuclear artillery pieces, as well as more than 1,200 combat aircraft, including almost 550 capable of carrying nuclear weapons. The warships include up to seven multirole aircraft carriers, 39 multirole nuclear-powered submarines, and 30 ships equipped with long-range cruise missiles.

I wish to emphasize one very important, in my view, detail. A powerful grouping of U.S. troops, which includes more than 175,000 men, is deployed in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet coasts, on the Japanese islands of Okinawa, Kyushu, and Honshu and in South Korea. It incorporates two divisions—one, a land division, the other a marines division, up to 130 tanks, and more than 600 combat aircraft, approximately one-half of which can carry nuclear weapons, plus up to 70 warships of the U.S. 7th Fleet, including one or two multirole aircraft carriers. It can be quickly reinforced thanks to the high strategic mobility of the U.S. Armed Forces. They graphically demonstrated this mobility in the Persian Gulf.

Directly regarding Japan, its "self-defense forces" are modern, well armed, and equipped with the latest combat hardware. Their overall strength exceeds 270,000 men. More than 40 percent of the total potential of their ground forces is located on Hokkaido, the closest island to us. This means approximately 50,000 personnel, almost 600 tanks, up to 800 field artillery pieces and mortars, 90 aircraft, and 128 antiaircraft guided missile launchers. Three infantry divisions and one tank division are stationed on the island.

If you compare the U.S. and Japanese Armed Forces in that region with ours, you can notice that they have superiority over our grouping: More than twice as many personnel, almost four times as many large surface ships, absolute superiority in surface ships with cruise missiles with a range of more than 600 km on board—the Soviet Navy does not have such arms at all—and more than twice as many tactical and naval strike aircraft.

We only have superiority in the Ground Forces earmarked for defense—twice as many tanks, and 50 percent more infantry fighting vehicles, armored personnel carriers, and artillery systems. So you can see for yourself that we cannot threaten Japan and its allies in any way and do not intend to do so.

[Litovkin] What role do the four islands of the South Kuril Chain play in the defense of the Soviet Far East coast? What forces are located on those islands? What, in general, is the military significance of these islands for the country?

[Omelichev] The islands of Iturup, Kunashir, Shikotan, and Khabomai constitute a natural border on the Pacific side on the approaches to the Sea of Okhotsk and the Soviet Maritime Kray. As you understand, on the one hand they substantially extend the sphere of our continental defense and, on the other hand, they ensure the security of communications lines linking the Soviet Maritime Kray and Kamchatka. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that sea routes of importance to us pass through the straits that separate these islands.

We have machine gun and artillery units of the Far East Military District stationed on these islands. In terms of their composition—there are approximately 4,000 men there—and structure they are capable of fulfilling only exclusively defensive tasks within the island territories. They have neither nuclear missile weapons nor subunits of airborne troops in their arsenal. Nor is there a single ferry or pontoon that could be used to cross from island to island. Nor do they have landing aircraft or helicopters.

So, as you see, the strength and armament of the forces stationed on the islands are minimal. They are earmarked only for defense.

[Litovkin] The position of our country's leadership and of the Ministry of Defense on the problem of the islands is well known today, but life does not stand still and neither does our state's international policy. With the strengthening of confidence and mutual understanding, various options for resolving disputed questions, including with regard to these islands, can arise. For example, the sides will agree to create a free economic zone on them or a decision will be adopted to grant the Japanese side an opportunity to utilize the islands' shelf, to create joint ventures on them.... What is the General Staff's attitude to such prospects?

[Omelichev] We will not guess which option will prove most acceptable. We at the General Staff are accustomed to dealing with real facts. I have spoken of the military aspect of the question, but, in addition, there are other aspects too. Time will show how they are tackled.

[Litovkin] Is Soviet-Japanese military cooperation possible in the long term? If it is, what specifically is meant by this?

[Omelichev] It could be a question, primarily, of developing confidence-building measures in the military sphere. What we mean by this is notifying exercises to be held, inviting military observers to them, limiting the scale and regions for holding exercises, and also exchanging military delegations. There could be other forms of cooperation too. For example, the Soviet Union has suggested to the Japanese side drawing up and concluding an agreement to prevent incidents at sea and to prevent dangerous military activity, similar to those that we have with other countries. The chief thing is that our president's visit to this country should end successfully, and then it will be possible to speak of many real steps toward each other.

Air Defense Forces Chief Tretyak Interviewed

LD1404191791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0945 GMT 14 Apr 91

[Interview with Army General Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak, commander in chief of Air Defense Forces, by V. Vovnenko at the Air Defense Forces Main Headquarters; date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Vovnenko] Each year, in the second 10 days of April, the barrier at the restricted zone of the Air Defense Forces [PVO] Main Headquarters is raised for us. This time we arranged to meet Army General Ivan Moiseyevich Tretyak, commander in chief of the PVO troops. [passage omitted]

[Tretyak] Well, if we look here we see an establishment shift team of a formation command post. These kind of establishment teams are in all the formations and units. We have them everywhere, and the viewers should know that all the comrades here are not especially selected here. This, I repeat, is an establishment team of which we have many. Everyone is well trained; everyone is a professional.

[Vovnenko] Could they conceal airspace violations from you, not report them to you, well, let us say, to avoid disturbing the commander in chief?

[Tretyak] No, they could not.

[Vovnenko] Is that out of the question?

[Tretyak] It is out of the question. There may be cases—for instance, in the Imishli salient, in Azerbaijan, where Iranian agricultural aviation was operating and flew in at an altitude of some 30, 40, 50 meters. The radars cannot see at that altitude. The border troops reported it. That means I learn about it from the border troops, or rather information is passed through our system that we did not see that target. So you could not say we concealed it. We simply did not see it. It is impossible to conceal a target because it goes up on the plotting board both here and in my office; we get it simultaneously. Whatever situation he has here, I get it on the same kind of board, but for the whole of the forces, both our aircraft that are airborne and reconnaissance aircraft. For instance, during the Team Spirit exercises in the east there were 10 or more Orion aircraft operating every day around the Sea of Okhotsk and the Kurils. We saw all of them. They were fully plotted on the board. We knew about them. When Mr. Cheney came here, we showed him at the command post of the Moscow District PVO where the aircraft were flying in the area of Alaska, Kamchatka, and the Kurils. He could see for himself that we saw them. So there is no problem of that kind.

They may report it late, be late in providing the information. They may delay it, which is bad. For that kind of thing we tell them off. He is supposed to provide data immediately. As soon as he has the data, he immediately passes it up, passes it on to the commander, and immediately makes a decision himself. He himself has to make a decision, because that is his job. The commander of the duty shift has to make a decision, and he does.

[Vovnenko] So, Ivan Moiseyevich, it seems that in fact your working day and your life around the clock takes place on a kind of map with coordinates, around which targets move all the time. How do you cope mentally?

[Tretyak] I think for me it is easier, as a participant in the Great Patriotic War, because there for four years we worked from dawn until dawn. There were no days off, no rest periods. Everything was done on the move, dynamically. Here it is a bit simpler because here we have certain rest periods. If, for instance, I go away, the duty shifts remain here and they report only when there is a clear violation either by our plane, or a hijack, or a violation by aircraft of adjoining states. They report those, but on the rest, they make decisions themselves. From the beginning to the end of a working day I am with them, working.

[Vovnenko] Ivan Moiseyevich, What about the fact that the Warsaw Pact ceased to exist as of 1 April? How are we now going to defend the Western border?

[Tretyak] You see, the Warsaw Pact included something else. I was officially the air defense commanding officer a unified Warsaw Pact system. Now it is no longer there. Now, so far, we only have several countries working with us. The rest have pulled out. Naturally....

[Vovnenko, interrupting] Which ones have pulled out?

[Tretyak] Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Of course, we had our reconnaissance range perimeter 600-700 km further forward. Now it runs along the USSR state border, and naturally the whole system has to be reviewed. That is what we are doing so we can see ahead, but now our friends are putting forward proposals to conclude bilateral agreements. Not multilateral like we had, but each country with our country, so we mutually inform each other. We have nothing against this option, and for example, the Romanian comrades have arranged a meeting with us in May, where we are going to sign an agreement on joint information on the air situation ahead. We will be providing information to them from over the sea and the flanks. Obviously things are more complicated for us now. But, we can reorganize the system and that is what we are doing.

[Vovnenko] Could you please tell us whether the people who work here have had the experience of the latest in the Persian Gulf brought properly to their notice? Is it being studied? How well are you, as the PVO commander in chief, informed about what took place?

[Tretyak] As the PVO, we have to be ready to fight against air space attacks at any time of day or night. Surprise plays a part here and raised combat readiness, or other states of readiness, is important so that we can at any moment go up against the enemy. That is the most important thing.

Well, as far as air forces were concerned, they had the [MiG] 21's there, the 23's, and 25's, and even the 29's, but Husayn sent most of them to Iran. According to the data which we have, depending on their accuracy, only several planes were shot down by the air forces.

[Vovnenko] The rest (?went through) space systems?

[Tretyak] Space systems had only one role there. First, they gathered intelligence and monitored surface-to-surface operational tactical missiles, just as over-the-horizon stations did, and oriented their Patriot antiaircraft missile systems for firing. If one were to say that the Patriot is highly efficient, I would not agree. Although at one time the Americans stated the Patriot was not meant to be an antimissile defense weapon, they now have shown the whole world that they developed it not only as an antiaircraft system, but an antimissile system as well.

Their reconnaissance was very well deployed. There were the AWACS planes, there were the F-111E electronic countermeasures planes, the TR-1 reconnaissance planes, the RS-135 strategic reconnaissance planes. Everyday there were up to 10 of them. They were there all the time watching Iraq completely. They were completely in charge of the situation. Naturally, of course, things were very difficult for the defending side. The conclusion for us is, of course, to have high combat readiness and such air defense assets as can fight against the new, most advanced air and space means of attack at any moment. [passage omitted]

[Vovnenko] Do you believe in UFO's?

[Tretyak] As yet I do not. I believe something else, that modern science and technology are capable of creating such spacecraft that could appear above us.

[Vovnenko] That is something I believe in too.

[Tretyak] This is something we have to keep an eye on.

[Vovnenko] You have to believe in man's ingenuity.

[Tretyak] SDI is a complicated thing, and the platforms that they are promising to make in their thousands are going to appear in every part of the world, and, they can be programmed to be at any altitude. So, we have to watch this carefully.

[Vovnenko] When there is talk about cutbacks in weapons, about conversion, even more and more often about cutting back the army, how is all this received by the country's PVO? What about that?

[Tretyak] If I am to be unequivocal, this is painful to us. They said the right thing, that quantitive cutbacks should be made up for in quality—that is, weapons. That is correct, but they have taken money away from us. I cannot buy from the state as much of this equipment as I need to make up the quality. All we have is the money they allocated to the minister of defense and which he passed on to us, the commanders in chief. Consequently, the rates of reequipment are going to be significantly slower and this will effect combat readiness.

Of course, our science has to keep up. The cutbacks in monies for scientific research work is also going to have an effect. And these have been cut back a lot. Things that are fine now will be obsolete in five to 10 years. They have to produce new, advanced things.

[Vovenko] Of course, over 10 years any progam would....

[Tretyak, interrupting] So here too it is a question of money. But we understand that the situation in the country is not easy. And for the time being, however much we might want it, the country cannot give anything even to the PVO troops which are on the very front line and are the first to go into battle, in the difficult conditions we are in now. Consequently we will have to maintain high combat readiness with what we have, maintain the technical state of all equipment, keep it well maintained, and be ready to carry out our tasks.

Moscow Garrison Party Secretaries Hold Conference

PM1604141591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report: "Action Promotes Perestroyka"]

[Text] A working conference of party committee and party organization secretaries of Moscow Garrison branches and categories of forces was held in the All-Army Party Committee.

Major General M. Surkov, secretary of the All-Army Party Committee, delivered a report on ways to resolve top-priority tasks that face the Army and Navy party organizations. He stressed the urgent need for active cooperation between party committees and commanders, staffs, and military-political organs.

One of the priorities in the activity of party organizations is the problem of the social protection of servicemen and members of their families.

The practical aspects of party work were also considered in speeches by the Party Committee Secretaries Major Generals G. Batanov and V. Tkachenko; Colonels A. Vozov, V. Kozlov, and Ye. Anikin; Captain First Rank N. Zelenina; and others.

The participants in the conference supported the initiative of holding a Communist "subbotnik" [day of unpaid labor] 20 April and backed the allocation of resources for extending and reconstructing the V.I. Lenin Museum and for the fund for the construction of the Central Museum of the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War on Poklonnaya Hill.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, USSR first deputy defense minister, and member of the CPSU

Central Committee, took part in the work of the conference and addressed it. Attention was given to the fact that the organizational period in the activity of the new party structures, which is complex in itself, should not distract them from the main point—working with people. The process of reforming the political organs and party organizations cannot be interpreted as simply a mechanical division of functions. Mutual relations between the military-political organs and the party organizations are undergoing qualitative transformations: They are moving from unconditional subordination to cooperation on the basis of equal rights, and from duplication of tasks to coordinated actions.

The idea of bringing the work of military-political organs and party organizations more closely in line with people's needs and concerns and with the problems of democratizing the USSR Armed Forces' sociopolitical life, ran through Colonel General N. Shlyaga's speech.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Veterans Note Forces' 'Responsibility'

PM1504135391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "Conference of Internationalist Servicemen"]

[Text] Riga, 9 Apr—There are more than 2,000 internationalist servicemen in the combat ranks of the Baltic Military District. On 6 April 470 representatives of this group of servicemen gathered for a district conference.

Lieutenant General P. Chaus, chief of staff and first deputy commander of the district and a participant in the combat operations in the Republic of Afghanistan, delivered the report at the conference on the main areas of internationalist servicemen's work in enhancing the troops' combat readiness and in the military-patriotic education of young people.

The conference participants spoke about the political events occurring in the country and in the Baltic republics. Their position was formulated in an appeal to the district's personnel. "Today," the document states in particular, "the USSR Armed Forces constitute one of the chief guarantors of the country's political stability and of ensuring favorable external conditions for the planned transformations, and it is the duty of servicemen to remember that, in accordance with Article 31 of the USSR Constitution, the country's Armed Forces bear responsibility for its territorial integrity and socialist choice."

The conference delegates roundly condemned attempts by certain political circles to use "afgantsy" servicemen in the country's hot spots as an anticommunist strike force.

"We will not permit the defilement of the memory of those who fell while fighting for Soviet power and to liberate the Baltic region from the German fascist aggressors—the immortal heroes of the 1st, 2d, and 3d Baltic Fronts, the 8th Estonian and 130th Lettish Rifle Corps, and the 16th Lithuanian Rifle Division, and the fallen partisans and underground fighters," the appeal states.

Participating in the work of the conference were District Commander Colonel Gen. F. Kuzmin and Major Gen. V. Vakar, chief of the Military-Political Directorate.

A district internationalist servicemen's council was elected.

Soviet Delegation Arrives in Estonia 14 Apr

LD1404142191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 14 Apr 91

[Text] A Soviet delegation is arriving in Tallinn today. A meeting between the Estonian Republic and the Soviet delegation will take place at 1000 tomorrow.

Now we are talking about an official dialogue, said [words indistinct], speaker for the Estonian legislature and head of the delegation of the Republic of Estonia. He stressed that the representatives of the Soviet Union will be accorded all the requirements of protocol, like all state delegations.

We express our gratitude for all the letters and the support we have received, said (Jugo Nugi), however, we ask you not to organize any rallies or pickets and not to hang any slogans or placards either on Monday or during the period when the negotiations are under way on the territory of Estonia; this would only impede work.

To remove any obstacles to the negotiations as well as for security reasons, rather strict measures are being taken. The negotiations will be held behind closed doors. At the beginning no press conference will be held. Just before the start of the negotiations, reporters will be allowed to enter the premises for a few minutes. The joint communique will be released by the news agency [word indistinct].

Delegations Discuss Ties, Plans

LD1504143691 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] Tallinn April 15 TASS—Soviet and Estonian delegations, set up to discuss political, social and economic issues, met here today. The Estonian delegation is led by speaker of the republican parliament Iulo Nugis and the Soviet delegation—by Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov.

The Estonian news agency reports that the meeting approved the plan and schedule of the delegations' work to settle relations between the Soviet Union and Estonia.

The delegations agreed on specific questions to be discussed at the next meetings and defined the order of forming working groups and of their activities.

The delegations agreed to meet at least once a month while working groups prepare questions.

'Ice Has Been Broken'

LD1504221191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2107 GMT 15 Apr 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] A meeting of the delegations of the USSR and Estonia was held in Tallinn on 15 April. At the routine meeting discussion continued on a broad set of political, social, and economic questions concerning the USSR and Estonia. Today also saw ratification of a specific plan and timetable for subsequent meetings.

[Begin recording] [N. Laverov, head of USSR delegation] In practice we are dealing with examination of all questions connected with the historical and juridical backing of those processes which are now going on, and with issues of further economic problems. We are not playing games. Now the people of Estonia are expressing their wish and this wish has been formulated in the results of the referenda of 3 and 17 March. So we must take these interests into account.

[U. Nugis, head of Estonian delegation] It remains for me to fully agree with what has been stated by Mr Laverov, and for our part to thank the Soviet delegation and specifically the leaders of the delegation. In a nutshell: The ice has been broken. [end recording]

Estonian Prime Minister Meets Urals Miners

LD1604104491 Tallinn International Service in English 2030 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] On Saturday morning [13 April], Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar met with representatives of striking Soviet coal miners from the southern Urals in a gesture of support for their protest action. Representatives of the miners came to Tallinn to take part in the Popular Front congress, which was held this weekend.

The Estonian prime minister also expressed gratitude to the Kuzbass miners who demonstrated in support of the Baltics during the violent Soviet crackdown on the Baltic states in January.

Leaders of the striking miners and Savisaar also exchanged information on their respective plans for further action and discussed the possibility of sending Estonian food and financial aid to the striking miners.

In his speech to the Popular Front Congress, Savisaar said that the strikes could develop into a Polish Solidarity-like trade union movement, which in turn could present a democratic challenge to the Kremlin leadership.

Estonian CP Official Reviews Party's Role

LD1704014591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1527 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Tallinn, 16 Apr (TASS)—The state of crisis in the Union should not breed illusions among the Republic's residents. Words about an "independent Estonia," allegedly already in existence today are self deception, a childish game.

This is the view of Enn-Arno Sillari, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party of Estonia [CPE], which he expounded at a report-back and election meeting of the Narva Town territorial party organization of the Independent CPEs. Today's edition of the SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA newspaper writes about that speech by the leader of the Independent CPEs.

Analyzing the economic situation in Estonia, the secretary of the Independent CPEs noted that agriculture presents quite a sorry picture. According to specialists' forecasts, 30 percent less meat and 15-20 percent less milk will be purchased this year, compared with last year. In his view, a package of laws reforming the Republic's economy, primarily its agriculture, is required to stabilize the situation. There are already draft laws on ownershp and land reform, but, according to E.A. Sillari, they need to be substantially improved.

Having dwelled on the situation within the party he heads, E.A. Sillary resolutely rejected the accusation by leaders of the CPEs [CPSU] to the effect that the Independent CPEs favor the socialist perspective and the interets of the working people, while, in deeds, it supports the Republic authorities' policies aimed at restoring capitalism in Estonia. "One cannot formulate this issue in such a way at all today, he said. One should not forget the lessons of the past. The Estonian Communists have twice failed to join the people. They have lost its trust. We will not commit such a mistake for the third time. Yes, our party acts in the interests of the working people and expresses the will of the Estonian people, its majority. The people unambiguously showed its will at the Republic referendum, having come out in favor of Estonia's state independence".

Baltic Council Leaders Meet in Latvia

Show Concern Over Negotiations

LD1504224191 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] The leaders of the legislatures of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, who form the Baltic Council, held a meeting in Jurmala. They issued a message to the USSR president voicing concern about the negotiations between union government delegates and the Baltic republics. For instance, the appeal says that in defining the status of the meetings the Soviet delegation avoided to describe them as talks or negotiations. At a meeting with the Lithuanian negotiators, the Soviet side avoided putting on record the denunciation of the use of force. The Baltic Council asked the president to empower the Soviet delegation to hold full-scale inter-state talks with the Baltic countries.

Reject Moldova's Call for Merger

LD1604101191 Tallinn International Service in English 2030 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] At a meeting of the coordinating body of the leadership of the three Baltic states in Jurmala, Latvia, last Saturday, Baltic leaders rejected Moldova's proposal to develop the Council of Baltic States into a union of six, together with Moldova, Georgia and Armenia, in order to form a peaceful resistance against the Soviet Union.

After a lengthy discussion, the Baltic leaders decided that they could not accept Moldova's proposal because of the different legal status of the six republics. Arnold Ruutel, president of Estonia, and Anatolijs Gorbunovs, president of Latvia, stressed that such a development could contribute to the Baltic issue appear to be an internal problem of the Soviet Union, which the Balts have always vehemently disputed. [sentence as heard]

Also, since the Baltics do not consider themselves a part of the Soviet Union de jure, such a union of six republics could also be interpreted as a Baltic attempt to dismantle the Soviet Union. However, in its joint communique, the Council pledged continued support for democratically minded forces in all the different Soviet republics.

Appeal to Gorbachev

PM1604154191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Irina Litvinova: "Baltic Council Decisions"]

[Text] Riga—A routine meeting of the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Supreme Soviet chairmen—leaders of the Baltic Council—has been held in Jurmala.

The Baltic Council has adopted an appeal to the USSR president. The document voices alarm over the incipient talks with the three Baltic republics. It notes that at meetings with the Lithuanian delegation, for example, the Soviet side refused to enshrine the idea of abandoning the use of force. The appeal says that the Soviet delegation avoids the term "talks" when defining the status of the meetings. The Baltic Council suggested that the USSR president show good will and give the USSR delegation the mandate to hold full-scale interstate talks with the Baltic countries in order to thus promote the resolution of the Baltic question.

The Baltic Council condemned the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on the results of the 17 March referendum. The document adopted stressed that the results of the referendum and its effects do not extend to the Baltic republics and have no legal bearing on them.

The Baltic Council accepted Iceland's suggestion to act as intermediary in talks between the USSR and the Baltic states.

In a separate document, the Baltic Council welcomed the proclamation of Georgian independence.

Lithuania Wary of Soviet Media Takeover

LD1604235691 Vilnius International Service in English 2300 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The Defense Council of the Lithuanian Republic headed by Vytautas Landsbergis held a meeting this evening. The possibilities of defending important objects of the Lithuanian communication system were discussed.

It was stated at today's morning briefing that the leadership of the parliament has information that the Soviet Army is getting ready for new actions on the territory of Lithuania. First of all, the Soviets aim to take over the communication system. Regular army troops that occupied the car driving school in the premises of Vilnius last week have handed it over to the Soviet Black Berets. According to the daily RESPUBLIKA, the driving school was taken over by reconnaissance soldiers from the largest military base in Vilnius, popularly known as the North Town. The reconnaissance unit was headed by Major Sitnikov.

The Defense department reports that several shots were fired from a passing car in a tunnel by the parliament building between 2 and 3 a.m. today.

Continuing Reportage on Lithuanian-Soviet Talks

Conditions for Talks Detailed

LD1704102491 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 9 Apr 91 p 1

[Text] As reported, a meeting of the negotiating delegations of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Lithuania took place in Moscow on 4 April. A joint communique and the official protocol of the meeting between the delegations of the Soviet Union and Lithuania were signed by C. Stankevicius, head of the state delegation of the Republic of Lithuania, and V. Doguzhiyev, head of the Soviet delegation. The following text was presented by the Lithuanian news agency:

The following issues were discussed at the official working meeting of the delegations and agreement was reached:

1. The status of the official meeting of the delegations: It was agreed to regard this meeting as an official working meeting of the delegations.

2. Principles of negotiations: The parties agreed to conduct negotiations while adhering to the following principles:
—to renounce raising preconditions;
—to enjoy equal rights in real terms;
—to respect human rights and the sovereignty of the parties;
—illegal means of influence on one another must not be used by the parties;
—to respect other universally recognized principles.

3. The objective of the negotiations is to regulate relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

4. Procedural issues of the negotiations:

4.1. The sittings of the official meetings are taken down in shorthand by the receiving party, and the shorthand record is handed to the other party at a fixed time.

4.2. A protocol of the sitting is signed after each official meeting where the questions discussed and agreements reached are detailed.

4.3. The sittings take place in Moscow and on agreement they can be held in Vilnius.

4.4. The working language of the sittings is Russian; in case of need, translation from Lithuanian into Russian and vice versa must be ensured; both the copies have the same validity.

4.5. Not less than one or two official meetings a month must be held by the delegations.

4.6. The meetings are described in a joint communique for the press. On agreement by the delegations, comments on some clauses may be limited.

4.7. A joint working group is being set up to coordinate the work of the groups of experts and to organize official meetings between the delegations.

5. According to a previous agreement, the following topics for the groups of experts have been defined:
—property;
—economic and trade relations;
—financial system and banks;
—transport, communications and power engineering;
—the ensuring of human rights and freedoms, and social security;
—problems of science and technology, humanitarian, and cultural issues;
—problems of the army and defense;
—state security and border regime;
—political, legal, and organizational aspects of mutual relations;
—preparations of draft document (documents) on relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union.

Additionally, the delegations agree to set up a group of experts on cooperation in the struggle against crimes.

The composition of the groups of experts is defined more exactly and the other party is informed about it before the next official meeting of the delegations.

To instruct the groups of experts to analyze legal acts of both the USSR and of the Republic of Lithuania in order to establish violations of rights and lawful interests of the sides. If there are such violations, prepare proposals on the means of eliminating them and, if need be, proposals to stop these acts.

6. The next official meeting of the delegations will take place at the end of April or beginning of May 1991. It is intended to examine the following issues:
—the increase of mutual trust during the negotiations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union;
—economic and trade relations, finances, and banks;
—problems of defense and the Army;
—property.

Ozolas Doubts USSR's Serious Preparation

PM1504130991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 5 Apr 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "Meetings in Moscow"]

[Text] A meeting between delegations on interstate talks between the Lithuanian Republic and the USSR started in the Kremlin at 1100 hours 4 April. Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy leader of the Lithuanian Republic state delegation and deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and a group of delegation members—Foreign Minister A. Saudargas; E. Zingeris, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Permanent Commission on Foreign Affairs; K. Glavjackas, deputy of the Supreme Soviet; and P. Kuris, adviser to the Lithuanian Republic government—arrived in Moscow the day before. They were joined yesterday by delegation members Minister A. Abisala; A. Butkevicius, general director of the Territorial Protection Department; and R. Ozolas, deputy of the Supreme Soviet, who, along with Deputy Foreign Minister V. Katkus; G. Serksnis, chairman of the Permanent Commission for the Restoration of the State; and E. Bickauskas, permanent representative of the Lithuanian Republic government in Moscow, had an almost four-hour long meeting as a working party with a similar party from the USSR delegation headed by USSR Justice Minister S. Lushchikov.

Sergey Lushchikov told a TASS correspondent that the meeting of the working parties marked a step toward talks. He described the meeting as constructive and said during it efforts were made to "clarify contentious issues to help avoid pitfalls during future dialogue." According to Lushchikov, one cannot yet talk about the start of official bilateral talks. However, he did express the hope that today's meeting of the delegations could develop into talks.

In short, the forecasts of the USSR justice minister, who is a member of the USSR official delegation on the talks, is highly optimistic.

But Romualdas Ozolas, Lithuanian Republic Supreme Soviet deputy is far more reserved.

From my standpoint, he said, the talks should have started long ago. But while the USSR side continues trying to describe serious problems as pitfalls, it will be difficult to approach the start of talks. At today's meeting we intend to start tackling all questions, but we consider the restoration of interstate relations as being of paramount rather than secondary concern.

Romualdas Ozolas voiced doubts regarding serious preparation for the talks by the USSR. In a certain sense his standpoint is shared by some foreign journalists, who are showing really keen interest in today's meeting. In their opinion, it is important for the Soviet Union to demonstrate to the world community its readiness for talks.

Stankevicius Views Meeting

PM1204134191 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 6 Apr 91 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Awaiting Positive Steps"]

[Text] C. Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet and deputy leader of the Lithuanian Republic state delegation, stressed this yesterday, at a press conference held in the parliament on his return from Moscow.

Stankevicius went on to elaborate: Above all we are talking about the future of television and the television tower, and other buildings seized by force. Unfortunately, he said, it was not made clear who is empowered to resolve this question.

This, added to the efforts by the USSR delegation, headed by V. Doguzhiyev, "to persuade" Lithuania to act within the confines of the USSR Constitution and consider itself a Union republic, was bound to leave a marked impression on the meeting's atmosphere. Admittedly, C. Stankevicius noted, the discussion became more constructive in the afternoon (the meeting went on for around seven hours). Nevertheless, the deputy leader of the Lithuanian delegation believes that the Soviet side was not prepared to talk seriously about the most vital problems—the restoration of interstate relations.

It was decided to discuss questions on ways to increase mutual trust, the status of the Soviet Army's presence in Lithuania, the problems of ownership pertaining to so-called Union controlled enterprises, and other issues at the next meeting, which is expected to take place in Moscow in late April or early May.

Lithuanian Council Passes Agrarian Reform Law

LD1704083691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Summary] The Supreme Council passed a law on agricultural companies today. It is one of the most important laws concerning agrarian reform. According to Eimantas Grakauskas, chairman of the Supreme Council Agrarian Commission, the new law enables the collective farms to reorganize into cooperative enterprises.

Decline in Lithuanian Economic Indicators Noted

LD1704100791 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] After more than half of the enterprises have reduced their production, Lithuania's industry turned out 3.5 percent less products in the first quarter of this year compared to last year.

Although there has been a reduction in production, the financial state of the majority of enterprises did not suffer much as the prices of products were increasing. Nevertheless, some 10 percent of enterprises failed to realize a profit.

A report published by the Statistical Department attached to the Lithuanian Government bears witness to a precarious situation in Lithuania's economy: production has declined by roughly 15 percent in the food and fuel industry and by 10 percent in the building material industry. The state purchase of livestock products has declined: of animals and poultry by 25 percent; of milk by 12 percent, and of eggs by 11 percent. Moreover, the number of animals has declined on collective and state farms; the number of hogs by 13 percent.

Of course, the supply of food products to the residents has not improved, and almost all nonfood goods are in short supply. As compared with the first quarter of last year, capital investment declined by 46 percent. The same percentage applies to housing construction.

The number of crimes has increased by 18 percent;, the number of serious crimes increased by one tenth.

Attacks on Lithuanian Communists Detailed

PM1004093791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "Against Political Terror"]

[Text] Vilnius, 8 Apr—The apartments of A. Naudzhyunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and J. Jermalavicius, head of a Central Committee department, have been shot at. S. Laurinaitis, deputy chief editor of the newspaper TARIBU LIETUVA, was beaten up in the city center. There have been more frequent cases of physical violence against secretaries of raykoms [rayon party committees]....

A joint statement by the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and Central Control Commission Presidium and Lithuanian Communist Party raykom secretaries refers to these occurrences as political terror. "The nature and thrust of these actions," the statement reads, "leave no doubt that they emanate from destructive forces seeking to destabilize the situation in Lithuania, to intimidate and split democratic forces, and thereby to divert its peoples' attention from the grave socioeconomic situation taking shape in the republic. These actions attest to a growing fascist threat...."

Lithuanian Prime Minister Departs for Canada

LD1604012491 Moscow TASS in English 2047 GMT 15 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius April 15 TASS—Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius left for Moscow today en route for a week-long visit to Canada.

Before departure from Vilnius, Vagnorius told journalists that the aim of his trip is to establish political and economic relations. He is due to meet Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and Foreign Minister Joseph Clark and representatives of the Lithuanian community in Canada.

Ligachev Memoirs Recall Lithuania Debates

PM1604112591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Apr 91 First Edition p 4

[Extract from memoirs of Yegor Ligachev under general heading "On Events in Lithuania Yesterday and Today": "Sign of Trouble: Pages from Book of Memoirs"]

[Text] All those notified by V.M. Chebrikov assembled in the Central Committee Secretariat hall of sessions on the fifth floor. When I opened the 7 April 1989 working meeting in connection with the events in Tbilisi I fleetingly recalled the last Politburo session (September 1988) which I had held. I shall say immediately that this reminiscence was by no means of a formal or personal nature. Some invisible link hovered between that Politburo session and the working conference at the Central Committee. In the tense atmosphere of that day this link was difficult to feel. But it undoubtedly existed.

On that occasion, in early September 1988, Gorbachev was vacationing in the Crimea. But when he went on vacation Mikhail Sergeyevich officially left me "in charge" and I held Politburo sessions. As always, there was more than enough to do. And inter alia they put on my desk a report from the KGB on the destabilization of the situation in Lithuania. It immediately drew the attention and demanded the best possible investigation of the thrust of what was happening in that Baltic republic.

And literally two days later Politburo Member Yakovlev returned from Lithuania. As was customary, he telephoned me and I asked what the situation in Lithuania was like. Aleksandr Nikolayevich replied:

"Nothing special is happening there. Nothing in particular, the usual perestroyka processes."

I admit that such a drastic discrepancy between the opinion of a Politburo member and the KGB report surprised me. I telephoned Chebrikov, who at the time worked as KGB chairman, and asked him not to fuel the situation.

"Viktor Mikhaylovich, you assert that the situation in Lithuania is developing in a dangerous direction but Yakovlev, who has only just gotten back from there, says that nothing in particular is happening, that there is no need to take any special measures."

"What do you mean nothing in particular," Chebrikov said in surprise. "The situation is alarming and unsettled and the consolidation of nationalist forces has begun...."

It was clear that the thrust of the matter had to be studied carefully. I would be insincere if I did not say that the strange discrepancy in the assessments put me more on guard than the actual KGB report. Here, forgive me, it is not logic but a politician's instinct which gets to work.

In a telephone conversation with Gorbachev I suggested:

"Mikhail Sergeyevich, I ask for your consent to include on the agenda of the next Politburo session the question of Comrade Yakovlev's trip to Lithuania. According to the KGB report an unfavorable situation is taking shape there."

Gorbachev agreed and soon the memorable Politburo session took place.

Yakovlev delivered the first speech. He said:

"Nothing dangerous is happening in the republic. Nor in the life and activity of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Yes, there are complications caused by the fact that the center has dictated too much to the detriment of the republic's development. The Union organs are overburdening Lithuania with industry, as a result of which the ecological situation has been complicated. There is an influx of Russians, not the best Russians unfortunately, and migration to the republic is growing. On this soil there are areas of friction and there are cases of disrespect for the indigenous population on the part of the Russian-speaking population. In this connection I suggest the following. First: Step up the work of the local organs with the nonindigenous population. Second: Halt migration. As a whole the situation in Lithuania is complex but not critical. The republic must pass through this in the process of perestroyka...."

I have kept the sheets of paper fastened together with a paper clip on which I had made notes in black felt-tip pen during Yakovlev's report so I am quoting by no means from memory but from notes. I made no comment at all on the speech because I had no grounds for not trusting a Politburo member. But later, when the events in Lithuania assumed first a menacing and then a catastrophic nature, when it was these events which became the catalyst of the centrifugal, destructive processes which questioned the very existence of the USSR, I recalled that speech of Yakovlev's many times.

I may be asked why, in the period of stormy debates on the Lithuanian issue, when the Lithuanian Communist Party was disintegrating before our eyes, when at the Congress of People's Deputies there were debates around the secret protocols to the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, why I did not make public that talk at the Politburo? After all that could have influenced the development of events. It is hard to answer that question. But after all you must not forget that it was precisely at that time that my hands were tied by the "Gdlyan affair" and the "Tbilisi affair."

Actually, I shall return to that memorable Politburo session. After Yakovlev I gave the floor to Chebrikov. The KGB chairman said:

"I assess the situation in Lithuania as acute. There is an activation of the nationalist forces which have penetrated the ranks of the Lithuanian Communist Party and are leading it toward a split...."

Yes, the split in the Lithuanian Communist Party did indeed happen, and quite rapidly. It was this split which entailed all the subsequent events. Yet that split had been predicted! It had been predicted clearly and unambiguously. And at that period, when it was entirely possible to appease passions and to prevent an unfavorable course of affairs. Again, as in many other cases, at the Politburo session there was a clash between two opposite positions, two opposite approaches. And here is what is striking—casting a mental gaze over the events of the past two years I can see that in the clash between different approaches the upper hand was gained by the person who subsequently led to great unpleasantnesses, not to say failures. And the sensible warnings, whose justice was fully confirmed by life, for some reason were not accepted.

At the Politburo session in question the positions of Yakovlev and Chebrikov were opposed. I remember well that all Politburo members who took part in the session were very surprised at such a drastic discrepancy in the assessment of the Lithuanian situation. And in order to avoid fueling passions I made a suggestion:

"Let's instruct the Central Committee departments to carefully study the situation in the republic and in particular in the Lithuanian Communist Party and to keep the Central Committee constantly informed of development trends. Also, let us take into account Comrade Yakovlev's report."

And that was what was decided.

Later I informed Mikhail Sergeyevich of the Politburo session. I said inter alia:

"Yakovlev's report was, I would say, of a soothing nature. It did not elucidate the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party."

Gorbachev did not react at all to that part of my report.

After that incident the Lithuanian problem did not once arise at the Politburo sessions—until the split in the Lithuanian Communist Party became a real threat. Then there were meetings between CPSU Central Committee Politburo members and leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party and a series of talks with Brazauskas and Gorbachev made a trip to Lithuania. As is well known, all these belated measures failed to produce a result. Later the split of the republic's Communist Party took place and Landsbergis and those who think like him came to power, setting as their goal the forcible restoration of the bourgeois system in Lithuania and the republic's wresting from the Soviet Union. There followed the outlawing of the Lithuanian Communist Party, which remained part of the CPSU.

Was it possible to avoid this tragic development of events? I reaffirm: Not only was it possible but we were obliged to do this! But the reassuring assessment which Yakovlev gave of the Lithuanian situation in 1988, when nationalism raised its head in that republic, played a sorry part. A social and class-based analysis of the processes in Lithuania was replaced by maneuvering, varnishing the truth, and a policy of appeasement.

Incidentally, the Central Committee departments attentively studied and analyzed the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party and sent notes to the CPSU Central Committee with truthful information. But the Central Committee leadership declined to make principled assessments or undertake vigorous actions and there was, I would say, a flirting with Brazauskas. Moreover, the processes taking place in Lithuania were made out to be virtually a model of perestroyka. As is well known, this complacency in assessing the Lithuanian situation cost the country dearly. At that time Yakovlev was actively engaged in making reassuring noises in politics, despite the losses which we incurred. He endlessly soothed us, urged us not to be edgy. One recalls the image of the reassuring Luka from Gorkiy's play "The Lower Depths."

As for myself, by virtue of certain circumstances I was no longer able to control the Lithuanian situation and was essentially removed from taking part in its solution.

These circumstances were as follows.

First, as I have already said, the memorable Politburo session was the last which I held. And second, the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat sessions which I had been leading soon stopped. How that happened and why I shall explain later. But Yakovlev remained a Politburo member and at the same time joined the Presidential Council and is now the president's senior adviser.

...There is no doubt that there was a close link between the Georgian and Lithuanian situations—they were both generated by the eruption of nationalist passions. But the situation in Lithuania was, so to speak, more advanced and it sketched in, as it were, the scenario for actions by other nationalist forces in other republics. And in this connection I recall that in February 1990, when the events in Lithuania had gotten a long way, at a routine CPSU Central Committee plenum talk about them naturally arose. V. Kardamavichyus, secretary of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform) said from the rostrum:

"If Comrade Yakovlev has his own opinion and the right to speak, then we, too, have our own opinion and the right to speak. We want to convey once again to the comrades that Comrade Yakovlev's stay in Lithuania did indeed introduce a number of bad things in our republic. Comrade Yakovlev, you probably also indirectly had a hand in the decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. That is being said very widely in the republic. That is reflected in our meetings with some Lithuanian intellectuals. And let's speak honestly to the Communists."

By that time an incredibly difficult situation had taken place around Lithuania and its Communist Party. But, however surprising it may seem, the draft resolution submitted to the plenum gave no political assessment of the events taking place in the republic. Moreover, the draft made an attempt to avoid at any price aggravating the situation. The split had already occurred in the Lithuanian Communist Party yet the draft resolution called for everything to be well "settled...." Still the same position of complacency which in fact leads to irreparable harm.

I do not know who prepared that draft resolution. I can say only one thing: I, a Politburo member, was not acquainted in advance with the draft, this draft was a surprise to me. It did not even denounce Brazauskas' splittist activity or support those Communists who remained on CPSU positions. The adoption of this draft would in fact have meant indulging the party's opposition forces, it lulled the party, slurred over differences, and opened the road to opportunism. It was no accident that when the draft resolution was read out the plenum auditorium was literally buzzing with amazement and indignation.

I would put it like this: The draft resolution on Lithuania in the situation which had taken shape by February 1990 was uniquely provocative. Probably the position of Gorbachev, who at that time nurtured the hope that everything would sort itself out and that everything would turn out all right, also played its part here. But one way or another I considered the adoption of this resolution to be impossible. And I asked for the floor in order to voice my sharply negative attitude. I submitted a proposal that we denounce the activity of the then leadership of the republic's Communist Party aimed at effecting a split and that we support those forces which advocated a united CPSU. (This speech of mine was published in the anthology "Materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum 5-7 February 1990.")

I was the only Politburo member to speak on this question. But many Central Committee members resolutely supported me and the atmosphere at the plenum began to be heated. I remember Academician A.A. Logunov, rector of Moscow State University, submitted a proposal in this connection that a recess be declared for 20 minutes in order to prepare another draft resolution. "An extremely crucial moment! Where are we going in such a rush? Everything must be carefully considered," Logunov said.

Gorbachev grasped the mood of the Central Committee members without difficulty and found his bearings in the situation and suggested breaking off for an hour to complete work on the resolution. Gorbachev, Lukyanov, and I took part in this work. As a result the new document was fundamentally different. It was adopted unanimously at the plenum. I shall say frankly that if at that moment we had not supported the Lithuanian Communist who remained on the CPSU platform, things would have been very bad for them in the situation of nationalist intoxication which had soon been created by Landsbergis after coming to power. (Footnote) (As is well known, the Lithuanian Communist Party, on the CPSU platform, was not only able to hold out against the nationalist attacks but is increasingly gaining authority in the republic. One of its leaders, V. Shved, has been elected a member of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. The growth of its influence was also clearly manifested during the referendum on the conservation of the USSR).

Incidentally, it was not only Kardamavichyus but also others who spoke at that plenum of Yakovlev's responsibility for the sharp aggravation of the situation in Lithuania. And so Yakovlev had to justify himself.

"It is always bad and awkward to try to justify oneself," he said. "Nonetheless I must make things clear since for the umpteenth time now at the plenum my name has figured in one way or another in connection with the Lithuanian events. What do I think on this subject and what did I say in Lithuania...? Is the situation in Lithuania lost? I do not think so. Are there dangers threatening? Undoubtedly, and they have in general been correctly indicated here. But there is something else apart from the danger. It must be admitted that the picture of the party organizations' inability to function—an all too familiar picture for us—had taken shape in the republic. The leadership had demonstrated shortsightedness...."

When I heard these words of Yakovlev's—about the shortsightedness of the republican Communist Party's leadership—I did not feel quite myself. I remembered how in September 1988 it was Yakovlev who had reassured us. It was he, primarily he, and not the Lithuanian comrades, many of whom were already sounding the alarm then, who had displayed shortsightedness. And here at the plenum there was not a word of self-criticism but merely accusations leveled at others.

I got up from the presidium table and approached Boldin, the chief of the CPSU Central Committee General Department, who was sitting at a separate small table. I asked:

"Valeriy Ivanovich, you remember that in September 1988 I led a Politburo session and Yakovlev reported on his trip to Lithuania. Has his report been kept?"

Boldin nodded:

"Of course it has been kept."

"Thank you." I returned to my seat and when Yakovlev had finished his speech I said clearly to Gorbachev, so that everyone in the auditorium could hear:

"Mikhail Sergeyevich, you may familiarize the plenum with Yakovlev's note on Lithuania."

"Why are you getting mixed up in this business?" Gorbachev responded.

But I repeated:

"I would ask you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to familiarize the Central Committee members with the note and the report which Yakovlev delivered after returning from Lithuania in August 1988...."

But the question nonetheless was not continued. And when I was brought the stenographic record of the plenum for correction I decided to cross out my rejoinder concerning Yakovlev's note. Why? Because at the same plenum a dispute arose between myself and Shevardnadze over the "Tbilisi case." A plenum cannot be turned into an exchange of fire. It was enough that the Central Committee members had heard my rejoinder clearly.

At the 28th CPSU Congress, too, there was no opportunity to speak of that memorable Politburo session when Yakovlev reported on the situation in Lithuania—like other Politburo members I myself reported to the congress. But I was greatly surprised when Yakovlev, to a direct question about his assessment of the situation in Lithuania in August 1988, replied from the rostrum that he had written no note for the Politburo and had no idea at all what this was about. That was an insincere reply.

Incidentally, it was not only the Lithuanian Communists who returned repeatedly to that trip to Lithuania by Yakovlev. This question arose at meetings, at congresses, even at Gorbachev's meetings with representatives of the artistic intelligentsia. At such a meeting in November 1990 the dramatist A. Abdullin said:

"Let's take at least Yakovlev's role in the Lithuanian events. Even six months after his trip to Lithuania in February last year he was giving assurances literally as follows: "I can see nothing terrible in the Baltic People's Front movement, I visited enterprises, the mood is fine, there are no problems, I think that everything will sort itself out there. We must be patient and not panic." What optimism!

Everything did sort itself out: Lithuania announced its withdrawal from the Soviet Union. That kind of optimism is akin to idiocy.

Incidentally, one more parallel is inevitably drawn between the working conference on Tbilisi and the Lithuanian situation. During Gorbachev's trip to Lithuania and his meetings with the Lithuanian intelligentsia one could hear on television praise of Yakovlev from the "Sajudis" supporters. In connection with what I have described above and the present development of events in Lithuania, this praise is of course interpreted in an entirely specific manner—precisely as V. Kardamavichyus said at the Central Committee plenum.

Here, of course, it is simply impossible not to mention the discussion of the "Tbilisi affair" at the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies (May-June 1989). When the commission for investigating the tragic events of 9 April was being formed E.N. Shangelaya said:

"Finally I think that it would be very correct if this commission were headed by Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. That is important because some time ago, in February, also at a difficult and tense time, he visited Tbilisi and took a specific stance, spoke on television, and his speech was very well received by all formal and informal organizations and all society. For that reason it would be correct, if he were to agree to head this commission."

Where these "specific stances" led can be seen in the example of Georgia and Lithuania. Yes, without any doubt there is some invisible complex link between the Lithuanian and Tbilisi events.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Pays 'Unofficial' Visit to France

Visit To Strengthen Ties

LD1404233791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2315 GMT 14 Apr 91

[Text] Strasbourg, 15 Apr (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman, arrived in Strasbourg on Sunday evening. In the course of his three-day unofficial visit to France, he will meet the leadership of the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, as well as representatives of political parties and French business circles.

In a statement at Strasbourg Airport, Yeltsin pointed out that his visit should serve to strengthen links between the Russian Federation and the West European countries, indicating that the aim of his policy was to return Russia to the "European home."

Meets With Baron, Lalumiere

LD1504175991 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 15 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Shvets]

[Text] Strasbourg April 15 TASS—Russian Federation Parliament President Boris Yeltsin, who is here on an unofficial visit, today met Enrique Baron, president of the European Parliament, and Catherine Lalumiere, secretary-general of the Council of Europe.

Prospects for the development of relations between the Russian Federation and these two major non-governmental European organizations were discussed during the meetings.

"Just as Europe will not be able to become great within the framework of the world community without Russia, so Russia will not be able to do without Europe," Yeltsin stated, emphasising the need for the establishment of mutually beneficial relations between the Russian Federation and West European countries without detriment to anyone.

As the sovereignty of the republic is legally formalized and conditions are created for independent foreign and domestic policies, Russia could become not only an observer but also a fully-fledged member of the Council of Europe, Yeltsin said.

Speaking about the state of affairs in the Soviet Union, the Russian Federation parliament president spoke out in favour of renouncing—in the interests of the peoples of the Russian Federation and the entire union—confrontation between various political forces.

He believes that the most rational way to overcome the existing socio-economic crisis is to create a coalition government enjoying the people's trust.

Baron Comments on Meeting

LD1604141291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1215 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Paris, 16 Apr (TASS)—Following yesterday's meeting in Strasbourg between B.N. Yeltsin, RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, and Enrique Baron, European Parliament Chairman, the latter stated today in an interview for the "Europe-1" radio station that he "did not invite" Yeltsin to Strasbourg, but had merely received news of his arrival from the French organization "Forum International de Politique." "I decided to meet him after consultations with the buro of the Europarliament," he reported. "I find him bold, but the affections of the European Parliament lie more on the side of Gorbachev's policy. I do not feel cheered after meeting Yeltsin, and I told him that just when we are uniting in Western Europe, we see that in another part of the continent people are moving further and further away from each other, disuniting, and frequently acting on the edge of an abyss."

Holds Strasbourg News Conference

LD1604193791 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Shvets]

[Text] Strasbourg April 16 TASS—Visiting Russian President Boris Yeltsin addressed a group of liberals and representatives of popular political parties of the European Parliament and held a news conference here today. He set out the Russian leadership's views on strengthening relations with West European countries and spoke about his assessment of recent developments in the Soviet Union.

On prospects of interrelation between the Russian Federation and West European countries Boris Yeltsin said that the declaration of sovereignty by Russia meant independent foreign policy which would be largely coordinated with the Soviet Union's foreign economic policy. As regards the foreign economic sphere, priority should be given to enterprises, organisations and concerns but not to the Russian or federal leadership.

Yeltsin spoke in favour of Russia's integration into European Community programmes for environmental protection. The introduction of the strict international environmental control standards, accepted by the European Economic Community, in the Soviet Union can impart a powerful impetus to the prompt solution of problems faced by Russia in this field.

Speaking about the war of sovereignties in the Soviet Union, Yeltsin said Russia had no intention to withdraw from the Soviet Union. On the contrary, it will act to facilitate the unification of republics and the signing of a new treaty of union.

Responding to a question about the process of democratization in the Soviet Union, Yeltsin favoured progress along the path which the world's civilized nations followed. This presupposes full observance of human rights, equality of all forms of ownership, including private, gradual transition to market relations in the economy and effective social protection of the population.

"Charity begins at home", Yeltsin said commenting on the economic assistance the Soviet Union used to render other countries. He said that as more than 40 per cent of the country's population now live below the poverty line, the Russian leadership refuses to provide economic assistance to other countries. Relations with them, according to Yeltsin, should be built only on the basis of mutually beneficial economic cooperation.

Also today, Boris Yeltsin had a brief meeting with UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

On Tuesday afternoon, Yeltsin left for Paris.

PRAVDA Reports Visit

PM1604140191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Bolshakov report under the "Question-Answer" rubric; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "B.N. Yeltsin in Strasbourg"]

[Text] "Is it true that B.N. Yeltsin is in France? Who invited him?"—we were asked this question yesterday over the telephone. We asked our Paris correspondent to answer it.

Paris, 15 Apr—Yes, B.N. Yeltsin did arrive in Strasbourg (France) yesterday. His visit to France is an unofficial one. He has been invited by the "International Political Forum" headed by J. Ellenstein, who, like B.N. Yeltsin, was previously a member of the Communist Party and then left it.

While unknown to the broad public, the "Forum" is nevertheless extremely influential and well-informed. It produces the quarterly journal COSMOPOLITIQUE. Not so long ago J. Ellenstein wrote in it: "We must prepare for the moment when the Soviet Union is faced with the need to radically change its European policy. It will have to agree to give East Europe a status similar to that of Finland or, better still, Austria. Let us speak plainly. We must help this moment to come. We are people who want freedom for Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, the GDR, and all of East Europe."

Despite the private nature of B.N. Yeltsin's visit, the published program indicates that he is being received by people at fairly high levels both in the "European capital" of Strasbourg and in Paris.

On his arrival in Strasbourg, B.N. Yeltsin said that he advocates "Russia's return to Europe." He explained that "strategic-type" agreements with West Europe must be discussed in the course of talks with the entire Soviet Union, at a time when every republic of the USSR should, in his opinion, have an opportunity to independently sign the relevant agreements in the economic and cultural spheres. In an interview with "Antenne-2" today, B.N. Yeltsin clarified that, when signing the Union treaty, Russia intends to leave within Union competence only questions of defense and control of the railroads and power generation system, and take hold of everything else, including foreign policy. B.N. Yeltsin also spoke of his plans to give foreign capital opportunities to acquire property on the territory of the Russian Federation.

To Meet Perez De Cuellar

LD1604123191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Excerpts] Boris Yeltsin, head of the Russian legislature, is on an official visit to France. We have just received a report from Paris. TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov reports:

[Passage omitted] Today, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's visit continues. He is to have meetings with representatives of various groups in the European Parliament. He is expected to met with UN Secretary General Xavier Perez de Cuellar, who is now in Strasbourg. This evening, Boris Nikolayevich arrives in Paris, where meetings are planned, above all, with Laurent Fabius, chairman of the French National Assembly, and also with representatives of French business circles.

I would like to end with another statement by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, made in Strasbourg: I came here not for help, but in order to arrange cooperation between Europe and Russia. TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov, especially for Russia's Radio.

Meets French Assembly President

LD1704081291 Moscow TASS in English 0702 GMT 17 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Yemelyanov]

[Text] Paris April 17 TASS—Within the framework of his private visit to France, Russian Federation Parliament President Boris Yeltsin on Tuesday had a meeting with Laurent Fabius, president of the French National Assembly—the lower house of French parliament.

Denies Split With Gorbachev

PM1704081191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[Yu. Kovalenko report on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin interview with the mass media: "B. Yeltsin's Unofficial Visit to France: After Strasbourg—Paris"]

[Text] Paris—The most important aims of B.N. Yeltsin's unofficial visit to Strasbourg—his first trip abroad as head of the Russian parliament—are to acquaint such prestigious organizations as the European Parliament and the Council of Europe with the main tasks facing the new leaders of Russia and its parliament and also to facilitate Russia's return to Europe. The chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet stressed this particularly during his meetings with European Parliament President Enrique Baron, representatives of various political factions, and Catherine Lalumiere, secretary general of the Council of Europe, and also during an interview with the mass media.

"Enrique Baron and I spoke about the need to work to establish contacts between the European Parliament and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet," B.N. Yeltsin said during a conversation with your correspondent. "He expressed readiness not only to establish contacts but also to develop some kind of legally formulated cooperation with us in the future. As for the Council of Europe, after the Russian Federation's state sovereignty and the independence of its foreign and domestic policies have been legally enshrined, we will endeavor to be not only observers but also members of this organization."

"Europe cannot be great in the world community without Russia," B.N. Yeltsin went on, "just as Russia cannot do without Europe, without being in the European home. Although this process will take place not straightaway but gradually, we must nevertheless strive to achieve this. Because of the fact that the Council of Europe has adopted a number of international conventions on human rights, cultural cooperation, environmental conservation, and so on, it is very important for us both to sign and implement these documents."

[Kovalenko] You are going from Strasbourg to Paris. What do you expect to emerge from your meetings with French politicians?

[Yeltsin] I have the highest expectations. I still think that I will meet with President Mitterrand. During a conversation with him I would above all like to speak of the situation prevailing in our country and dispel the impression here that we have an irreconcilable split with President Gorbachev and that this will attack perestroyka. We do of course have political differences with him, but we will join forces if it is a question of defending our country from right-wingers. [Yeltsin ends]

Will Russia be able to join the Council of Europe? People in Strasbourg think that impossible. Only "sovereign states recognized by all" can be members of this council. If you admit Russia, officials at the Palais d'Europe—where this organization has its headquarters—explain, "Pandora's box would open," and tomorrow the Serbs, the Balts... would want to join.

Will F. Mitterrand receive the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet? This question is being discussed from all angles in the French press. Observers reckon that in this case the Elysee Palace has found itself in a somewhat delicate position. People there are afraid that receiving Gorbachev's main rival might somewhat "hurt" the USSR president, and they would not want that. Lastly, people at the French Foreign Ministry are emphasizing the "private" nature of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman's visit.

Observers point out that Paris and other Western capitals see M.S. Gorbachev as the politician who initiated perestroyka in various spheres, including the international sphere, and who has achieved real results. Despite the country's colossal internal problems, the USSR president can, in their opinion, extricate it from the crisis with Western assistance. They do not want to make this task difficult for him.

Further Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to France

WA1504185191

For further reportage on the visit by RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin to Strasbourg, France, including reports on his talks with European Parliament leaders, please see the International Affairs section of the 15 April West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Moscow To Create Municipal Police Force

LD1604214591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 2030 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] In connection with the president's illegal decree on creating within the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs a main directorate to oversee the internal affairs of Moscow and Moscow Oblast, we are now working on setting up a Moscow municipal police force, (Aleksandr Tsopov), deputy chairman of the Moscow City Soviet's Commission for Legality, told a correspondent from the Russian news agency. He noted that a decision on transforming the main directorate of internal affairs into the Moscow municipal police with the status of the main directorate of the Moscow City Executive Committee is expected to be adopted at a sitting of the Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium tomorrow, 17 April. General Vyacheslav Komissarov will be head of the police. In (Aleksandr Tsopov's) words, while the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is trying to prove that a municipal police force is not needed, Moscow has no law-enforcement body today that will protect Muscovites.

RSFSR Presidential Candidates Considered

91UN1298A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 13 Apr 91 p 2

[Article by "independent commentator" Aleksandr Tayurskiy: "An Attempted Forecast: Yeltsin, Bakatin, Sobchak, or...?"]

[Text] While Boris Yeltsin rests in the Red Stones resort, gathering strength before he applies his extra executive powers, it seems that the presidential race has already started in Russia. Of course, the start-up signal has not been given yet, but future participants are already warming up on the lawn next to the track, and this is very visible not only to attentive voters, but to chance passers-by as well.

The first to arrive at the starting blocks for the presidential chair was radical Leningrader A. Sobchak. Finding himself accidentally in London, he deemed this podium a good enough place to shoot a few critical arrows in the direction of B. Yeltsin. The Leningrad City Soviet chairman accused the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium of having spent too much time criticizing President M. Gorbachev and too little time implementing land reform and the introduction of private enterprise in the republic.

This critique also sounds as a barely concealed promise to the already powerful stratum which Sobchak calls the "middle," or "entrepreneurial" level. At the same time, it is an appeal for support.

Thus, a small, and so far mysterious in many respects, circle of politicians—contenders for the Russian presidency—is beginning to take shape. Sobchak's move is far from accidental. He generally does not make too many accidental, and even fewer erroneous, moves. In two years, one can count them on the fingers of one hand. The current move shows, in addition to all other things, that by now for many people Yeltsin's leadership is far from an obvious choice. According to the latest opinion polls, his popularity rating has entered a period of rather modest parameters; thus, other politicians, sensing this deficiency in the hearty popular support for him, decided to jump into the fray.

Who else, in addition to these two, has a realistic chance of participating in the fight?

It is clear that the chair of Russian president is a piece of furniture that is too big for the miniature Travkin and too elegant for M. Bocharov who came to the political arena from the Butek quarry.

However, there are candidates who are, in my opinion, quite real. First there is Vadim Bakatin, who in the past year survived a political drama that was largely hidden from the public. If he decides to run, it will become immediately clear that the out-of-favor minister has an enormous number of supporters. Also, strange as it may seem to some, N. Ryzhkov may decide to step in. The point is that much of what was said by the former prime minister a year or a year-and-a-half ago turned out to be prophetically true. And for much of what he was not permitted to do (remember, for instance, how unanimously the Supreme Soviet in the fall of 1989 shot down his attempt to raise prices on delicatessen foods) we now have to pay a triple, or even higher, price.

The list of candidates is open....

Shakhray Discusses New Powers, Presidency

LD1704030991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1640 GMT on 16 April on the "Legislative Herald" program carries a 15-minute interview with Sergey Shakhray, chairman of the Committee for Legislation of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet by RSFSR Supreme Soviet member Sergey Nosovets.

The interview begins with a discussion of the additional powers given to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. Shakhray notes that it is not only a question of additional and emergency powers. He says: "It is a question of distribution of power between the supreme bodies of state power of the Russian Federation in the crisis period." "It is a question of new rights and new obligations of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, of its Presidium, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers and its chairman," he added. Shakhray then explains the reasons for the Commitee for Legislation adopting an approach of singling out what these bodies cannot do. He says: "These delimitors have been placed on the following: while using these powers, lawfully elected bodies of power cannot be dissolved; this is very important. The national-state organization of the Russian Federation cannot be altered. The borders between Russia and other Union republics cannot be changed. The state and public order of the Russian Federation cannot be changed."

Shakhray adds: "The Supreme Soviet is given the right to adopt laws, including those within the competence of the Congress of the RSFSR People's Deputies, with their subsequent endorsement by the congress. It is not allowed to do only one thing—to adopt a new Constitution. Emergency measures, or measures of an emergency nature, can be introduced by supreme bodies of power in Russia only by agreement with the Supreme Soviets of republics and local, kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies. In this area, special care is needed when dealing with republics within the composition of the RSFSR."

Shakhray continues: "Any act by a lower body of state power or administration can be revoked. Any person violating the Constitution and laws of the RSFSR can be dismissed. If this official was elected, then formulas for suspending his powers and presenting the body that elected him with a motion to release him from his post. In relations with the Union, such measures as coordination of positions, exchange of plans, reaching accords, etc. should be used. In cases when Union bodies exceed their powers and those provided for in the USSR Constitution and encroach upon the competence of the Russian Federation, such decisions should be abrogated by the bodies of power and administration."

Shakhray cites cases when these powers should be used. These include the anti-famine-91 program, land reform, work to strengthen the structure of law and order bodies and security bodies, the Union treaty, national-state organization, conversion, economic reform and strikes.

Shakhray next offers his opinion on the authors' draft on the Russian presidency presented by the Committee for Legislation. He assesses that the pre-election campaign should be divided into two major stages. One should be held before the congress in May, and another should be held after the congress. On the basis of the law on electing a president, which contains 14 articles, a pre-election campaign should start in April, he says, adding: "Registered republican political parties, professional candidates, labor collectives, enterprises, establishments, organizations, meetings of citizens of the constituencies also have right to nominate a candidate, with the condition that such an initiative is supported by 1 million Russian Federation citizens in the form of a collection of signatures."

Shakhray says every candidate will be given a platform, including Television, to present his program. Candidates need to collect "not less than a third of the vote of the Russian Federation," he says. This means that in theory three candidates can be passed by the congess, but in practice there will be only two of them. So, at the last stage only two candidates are left. This is the way towards a two-party system, he says. A candidate is elected if "not less than a half of the citizens included in the electoral roll cast their votes." The candidate who gets the majority vote will win: On 12 June the Russian Federation will get its first president, Shakhray says.

Shakhray then comments on "the war of laws" and the reasons behind it. He says: "Rallies and demonstration can be banned only by bodies of power in some regions by agreement with republics. If a republic does not agree, then a decision at the Union level can be adopted by at least two-thirds of the vote. But the president in person and the Cabinet of Ministers have no right to ban rallies, meetings, and demonstrations and thereby deprive citizens of their constitutional right."

Organizing Committee for Science Academy Named

PM1504151991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Item from roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, REUTER, UPI reports: "Organizing the Russian Academy of Sciences"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium has approved an Organization Committee to draft the charter and principles for selecting the founding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The posts of president-organizer and vice president-organizer of the Russian Academy of Sciences have been established. The corresponding appointments have been made. Academician Yuriy Sergeyevich Osipov of the USSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Mathematics and Mechanics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences Urals Branch, has been appointed president-organizer of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Doctor of Chemical Sciences Professor Abdulakh Kasbulatovich Mikitayev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Science and Public Education Subcommittee on Science, has been appointed vice president-organizer of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The RSFSR Council of Ministers has been instructed to make the necessary practical arrangements for the Russian Academy of Sciences activities by 30 April 1991.

Kursk Plenum Attacks 'Apostate' Rutskoy

PM1704091191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Vladimir Kulagin: "Attacks on Deputy"]

[Text] Kursk—A hastily convened Kursk RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Obkom [oblast party committee] plenum condemned Communist A. Rutskoy's position at the Third Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

Hero of the Soviet Union Aleksandr Rutskoy, member of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, who was elected as a deputy from Kursk Oblast, earned his fellows' disfavor for activity which, the plenum resolution said, was "designed to split the 'Communists of Russia' deputies' group." The deputy has also been accused of "attempting to provoke a split within the CPSU." Incidentally, proposals were made at the same plenum for the "apostate" to be expelled from the CPSU. This probably would have happened had Aleksandr Vladimirovich been registered with one of the party organizations here.

The Kursk City Council of War, Labor, and Armed Forces Veterans sent a letter to the city soviet of people's deputies calling for A. Rutskoy to be deprived of the title of "Honored Citizen of the City of Kursk."

This was the way in which a sizeable proportion of the party apparatus and veterans in Kursk and the oblast reacted to the courageous step taken by A. Rutskoy, who set up a new faction "Communists for Democracy" at the Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. According to a number of deputies, including those from Kursk Oblast, by rallying his confederates around him he definitely contributed to the consolidation of truly democratic forces in Russia and facilitated the congress' positive results.

Western Republics

Minsk Strikers Demand Union Chief's Resignation

LD1604135691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1300 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Talks were held in Minsk today between representatives of the strike committee and leaders of the republic's trade unions. (?Marych), deputy chairman of the federation of the republic's trade unions, told a TASS correspondent that the strikers demanded the resignation of Goncharik, head of the trade union organization, and insisted that office space be given to the strike committee. These issues will be discussed on 18 April at a plenum of the republic's federation of trade unions.

Ukrainian Strike Committee Established 16 Apr

LD1604203491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 16 Apr 91

[TASS report from Kiev]

[Text] The Ukrainian strike committee was set up here today. (Nagornyy), a miner from the Krasnoarmeyskaya mine, Donetsk Oblast, became its chairman. This was announced at a thousand-strong rally for the defense of the working people's economic and social rights. It was stated at the rally that Kiev strike committees fully support both the economic and political demands of the striking miners. A collection of means to help the miners was organized on the spot.

Rallies Support Strikes

LD1604213491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Lidiya Ilchenko in Kiev, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] This morning many people in Kiev found it hard to reach their places of employment. Some buses and trolleybuses did not run their routes. Their drivers had declared a strike. Workplaces also remained empty at some industrial enterprises in Kiev. After all, hundreds of people gathered to greet the morning in October Revolution Square. This event took place despite a decree by the republic's Supreme Soviet which imposed a moratorium on rallies during working hours. Those attending the rally voiced their support for the striking miners of the Donbass, demanded the dissolution of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, and expressed their disagreement with the rising prices of goods, food, and services. All this was timed to coincide with the opening of the latest sitting of the republic's legislature.

At that time, the session of the Supreme Soviet started work. Taking account of the situation in the Ukraine, the legislators and the government of the republic are seeking concrete possibilities for defending the social rights of the working people in connection with the center's unpopular raising of prices many times over. Today, at the suggestion of Leonid Makarovich Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, a majority of deputies voted to end strikes at all enterprises in the republic. Moreover, they were guided by one very important argument: Anyone who values the Ukraine's sovereignty must help all the people bring it into being with a specific labor contribution.

This evening, after the working day had ended, another rally took place, organized by the Kiev Council of Trade Unions. Those attending it, collectives of industrial enterprises, demanded that Kiev be accorded the status deserved by a city that suffered from the Chernobyl accident, that prices of essential items and food be lowered, and that the five percent tax on sales and services be abolished, besides making other demands of an economic and social character.

TASS on Rally's Demands

LD1604225791 Moscow TASS in English 2203 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Aleksandr Litvinov and Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev, April 17 TASS—A Ukrainian republican strike committee was set up in Kiev on Tuesday. Aleksandr Nagorniy, a miner from the Krasnoarmeiskaya mine, was elected committee chairman. The mine was the first to go on strike in the Donbass coal field, participants in a rally of many thousands in Kiev were told today.

The rally was organised by Kiev trade unions to protect economic and social rights of working people. But local strike committees and representatives from striking coal fields in the republic managed to make the rally a political one.

People's deputies of the Ukraine and the Kiev City Council, miners, workers, physicians and culture workers called on the Soviet president and the USSR Government to resign. They demanded that the Soviet and Ukrainian parliaments be dissolved and enterprises, the KGB, the Interior Ministry and the Army be depoliticised. They rejected the idea of a Union treaty and called for nationalising the Ukrainian Communist Party's property.

Kiev strike committees fully supported economic and political demands by striking miners. Participants donated money to the fund to help strikers. Speeches by colliers from Donetsk and Chervonograd were acclaimed with an ovation.

Participants cheered the announcement that 500 miners, who have already arrived in the Ukrainian capital, will be joined here on Wednesday by another 1,000 miners.

Participants demanded that the Ukrainian parliament and government raise salaries, cut prices for foodstuffs and basic goods, cancel the five-per-cent "presidential" tax and pass legislative acts on indexing money incomes by the population.

Striking miners read out an appeal to working people and democratic forces in the Ukraine and the Soviet Union.

Supreme Soviet Rules Against Strikes

LD1604224391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine resumed work today after a break. Having changed the planned agenda, the deputies demanded an immediate report from the government on the measures it is taking in the tense situation that has arisen since retail prices were increased.

Fokin, chairman of the republican Council of Ministers, gave a report. He said that general compensation of 65 rubles [R] a month has been established, with R105 for miners. A number of payments for children have been increased. Compensation for women who are not working has been established. It is planned to reduce maximum prices on a number of essential foodstuffs. Also, in connection with numerous breaches in price, a special inspectorate for checking prices, independent of local bodies, has been created.

Meanwhile, miners who had arrived in Kiev gathered at the city's central square. Representatives of their strike committees spoke at the Supreme Soviet and confirmed their intention to continue the strike. Some opposition deputies spoke in the square calling for the expansion of the strike. The Supreme Soviet replied by deciding to regard any appeal for a strike as an appeal for a breakdown of the republic's economy and, in turn, as a move against the sovereignty of the Ukraine.

Ukraine Suspends Gorbachev Resources Decree

LD1604221991 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnianskiy]

[Text] Kiev April 17 TASS—The Ukrainian parliament on Tuesday decided to suspend the Soviet president's decree of April 12 "On Urgent Measures to Provide Material Resources to Enterprises, Associations and Organizations".

The presidential decree aims to prevent continuing disruptions in existing economic ties, which result in stoppages of enterprises and threaten the country with chaos and mass unemployment. Two out of the decree's three provisions call to rescind within a week the resolutions by republican and local authorities forbidding enterprises to ship their products to other republics, territories or regions, as well resolutions on the centrally unauthorized use of products allotted to customers for filling state orders.

The decree says that orders issued by the USSR Ministry of Material Resources for supplies of products in 1991 are binding on all enterprises, associations and organisations irrespective of their direct subordination or location.

The Ukrainian parliament notes in today's resolution that the Soviet president's decree contradicts the Constitution of the Ukrainian Republic and the laws and resolutions on the Ukraine's economic independence, the priority social development of the countryside and the agroindustrial complex in the republican economy and on the introduction of a single state order for products and services. The resolution stresses that the Soviet president's decree had not been coordinated with the Ukrainian parliament and Council of Ministers.

The Ukrainian parliament instructed relevant republican bodies to ensure the protection of the economic interests of enterprises, associations and organizations in implementing the parliament resolution.

Ukraine Government, TU Appeal to Kiev Workers

PM1704091991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Sergey Tsikora: "Echo of Minsk on the Streets of Kiev"]

[Text] Kiev—An appeal by the republican government and the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Federation of Independent Trade Unions Council to Kiev working people was read out on Ukrainian radio Sunday morning [14 April].

The day before, local papers, citing the independent Ukrainian RESPUBLIKA News Agency, published a report to the effect that a strike committees' conference had been held in Kiev. A decision had been approved to support the striking miners' demands and seek implementation of the student hunger strikers' demands in accordance with the republican Supreme Soviet resolution of 17 October 1990. The Kiev strike committee called for a strike on Tuesday 16 April. However, the workers' collectives were given the final say: They would name the actual date of the strike. The RESPUBLIKA news agency claims that representatives of around 50 of the city's enterprises had already approved the Kiev strike committee's decision to begin a strike.

The bleak prospect of a repetition of the Minsk events on the streets of Kiev was the main argument for immediately drawing up the appeal by the Ukrainian Government and trade unions to Kiev working people. "The unprecedented price increases imposed by the center were a shattering blow," it says. "People are not only uncertain about the future, but are frightened of it and this is causing a dangerous increase in social tension." Here is a further excerpt: "The USSR Cabinet of Ministers was told that the unwarranted increase in the cost of travel on suburban railroad transport was categorically rejected."

The appeal notes that the republican government is making every effort to ease the impact of the price increases. The 5-percent tax on industrial goods for children has been abolished and prices in school, technical college, and higher education establishment dining rooms are now protected. The government is "working on proposals on the reduction of prices of a number of goods and services, including certain types of meat products."

What kind of response do the Ukrainian Government and trade unions expect from the people of Kiev? "Display wisdom, a sense of proportion, and restraint; refrain from actions that will make the already critical situation in the republic's economy and social and political life even more difficult."

A rally that took place in Kiev Sunday afternoon will give an idea of the initial reaction to this appeal. It was by and large a quiet affair, although the organizers lost control of it at the end. Several thousands of people streamed toward the city center, halted traffic on the Kreshchatik, "besieged" the Ukrainian State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting building, and demanded an opportunity to go on the air. The demonstrators included many miners from the Donbass and some military conscripts, who have never participated in such events before.

A routine plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee began in Kiev Monday 15 April.

Gurenko Against Treaty's 'Hasty Signing'

PM1604120591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Apr 91 p 1

[O. Musafirova report: "Khmara Behind Bars Again"]

[Text] Answering a question about the development of the political situation in the republic at a recent news conference, L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, remarked: If deputies and the government are full of responsibility in their actions, the Ukraine will stand its ground. Events of recent days attest that the Ukraine is finding it increasingly hard to "stand." It is tantamount to carrying water in a sieve to keep in check the multivoice and multiparty but, most frequently, nonparty indignation of thousands of people by using the forces of a parliament in which there is no unity. So, what is it today that calls the people to Kiev, and the people of Kiev to rallies?

Above all—the price hike. A plenum of the Ukrainian Communist Party city committee responded to it with very harsh wording. Not even in the period of glasnost will newspapers print the epithets conferred on the union leadership on their pages.

However, everything must not be reduced just to a "sausage revolt." "I oppose the hasty signing of the Union Treaty—which is what USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev is calling for," S.I. Gurenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, declared at a meeting with workers of Kiev's Artem Production Association. In his opinion, the treaty must be elaborated comprehensively and carefully in the republics and must become a norm of life only after approval by them. The leaders of other parties—the Ukrainian Republican Party, in particular—long ago expressed their attitude to the treaty, the Union, and the president with a laconic "No." Something almost incredible is happening: Political opposites are coming together in the Ukraine in their attitude to the "center."

The "affair of Deputy Khmara" has fueled passions. It is known that Khmara's detention regime was changed before the trial, and he was released from Lukyanovskaya Jail's detention center. Stepan Ilich hardly had time to hold a news conference in Kiev and several rallies round about before he was rearrested—right by the aircraft steps at Donetsk Airport. Is it any wonder that the sanctioned rally held last Sunday, 14 April, on the initiative of the Ukrainian People's Democratic Party under the slogan "Freedom for Political Prisoners—Freedom for the Ukraine!" grew into a spontaneous march through the city's central streets?

The demonstrators blocked traffic in Krasnoarmeyskaya and Kreshchatik Streets and mounted pickets outside the Ukrainian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting building, demanding a live broadcast for representatives of the striking miners from Lugansk Oblast. The leadership of the television center agreed to make the airwaves available—but the next day.

The word "strike" was heard repeatedly at the rally, but it has not yet taken the form of a specific appeal by the city strike committee. The strike is scheduled for 16 April, and a repeat of the Minsk version is possible.

Ukraine Prime Minister Comments on Prise Rises

LD1604121491 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The Ukraine republic's capital has become a hot spot in the last few days. Our correspondent reports that a strike by drivers of electric transport began today. The city's major enterprises have partially halted work. A rally has been scheduled for 1700, organized by the city council of trade unions which has decided to lead the movemnt of protest at the prices rises. Let me remind you that appeals to lead the columns of protesters were also uttered at the recent plenum of the Kiev city committee of the Ukraine Communist Party. However, without waiting for the official protest action, people came out early in the morning to spontaneous rallies on Kiev's central square and to the building of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. At the demand of supreme soviet deputies, Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin has just spoken at the session. He called the Union government's program of prices rises an operation without anaesthesia. However, in the current situation prices cannot be lowered significantly in the republic. This would lead to the draining of the goods market, to the mass export of goods to republics where prices remain higher. The only acceptable path, in Fokin's view, is an increase in compensation and material assistance for the public.

Ukrainian Student Groups Merge

91UN1275B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 91 p 1

[Article by O. Musafirova: "And the SUS Steps Forward"]

[Text] Kiev—Two organizations, whose names became well known to many after the October hunger strike, have merged into one—the Ukrainian Student Union, with its center in Kiev, and the "Student Fraternity," with its soul in Lvov. They united for the sake of a closer objective—together to beat up "the old man," the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, which did not fulfill its decree of 17 October last year, and for the sake of long-range general democratic tasks.

The congress welcomed two people's deputies of the Ukraine—Lezko Lukyanenko, chairman of the Republican Party, and Mikhaylo Goryn, cochairman of Rukh [Ukraine People's Movement]. The gentlemen deputies, touching on regulations, asked that even more pressure be brought on the Supreme Soviet, and expressed confidence that they were dealing with a muscular force of millions that controls the situation in the Ukraine. After inspiring the youth in this way, the parliamentarians left the hall before the intermission.

The speakers who followed were much more restrained in their evaluations. All recognized that the phenomenon of the student movement now is such that it could...disappear entirely.

To the post of head of the Union of Ukrainian Students (SUS)—this is the name that was agreed to—a person was sought who was not arrogant, and who was intelligent but decisive. It turned out to be Vladimir Cheremis, a fifth-year undergraduate in the physics department of Kiev State University, who was expelled twice for "student disturbances."

Union Deputies From Ukraine Defend Efforts

91UN1275A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 27 Mar 91 p 1

[Letter from deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Ukraine to people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR at the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet: "Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Contrasted to Ukrainian SSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

Our appeal to you is dictated by deep concern for the fate of our country and the republic at this difficult time. We perceived with satisfaction the results of the USSR referendum and the republic poll during which an overwhelming majority of the workers of the Ukraine expressed itself for the preservation of the Union as a renewed federation of sovereign and equal states and for the participation of the republic in the Union on the principles of the Declaration of Sovereignty of the Ukraine.

We believe it our duty to achieve a realization at the level of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the numerous problems of a legal and socioeconomic nature that are troubling residents of the republic. In daily parliamentary life we try to maintain close ties with our constituents, and we are guided by the mandate they gave us.

We are convinced that our activity promotes the strengthening of the Union and realization of the principles of the declaration of sovereignty of our republic. With the active participation of the USSR people's deputies from the Ukraine, a number of fundamental laws were passed in the Supreme Soviet which served as a good normative basis for the adoption of appropriate legislation, including in our republic. We will recall at least such legislative acts as those on land, property, pensions, freedom of conscience, the "Chernobyl" program, and others.

At the same time, we are disturbed by statements, which have become more frequent of late, that raise doubts about the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and about USSR people's deputies in the USSR Supreme Soviet who were elected from the Ukraine.

We will not conceal the fact that we read with bitterness and resentment words in one of the republic newspapers that "it should not be assumed that the deputies elected from the Ukraine represent the interests of the people of the Ukraine... They represent the interests of that organ to which they were elected. They are all united there—the Congress and the Supreme Soviet... Working within the framework of this organ, they somehow unite and act within the scope of their own powers and the powers of the given organ of authority... Some general interests do appear, and some specific functions. They live with their own internal political life..."

We very likely would have let this statement pass if it had not come from the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet. It simply is unbelievable that these are his words; however, you see, no denials followed...

Such assertions in fact cancel out all of the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet, actually make the work of the USSR people's deputies pointless, and set society against them. It is impossible also not to see that the deputy corps of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Ukraine is contrasted to the parliament of the republic. What are the grounds for such assertions? At the very least this offends our human dignity and honor as deputies. None of us claimed or claim that we believe ourselves to be the spokesmen for the will of all the people of the Ukraine, but we always remember whom we represent and who elected us, we are guided by the USSR Constitution and the law on the status of USSR deputies, and we express the will of our constituents.

Hundreds of thousands of workers of the Ukraine voted for each of us. Of course we have to work together, fruitfully, and with results. We sense the need for closer contacts and concerted joint work for the benefit of the Ukraine and our common cause. We will say frankly that we counted very much on a mutual exchange of information, on regular meetings with you and with the leaders of the republic, which we were promised at a meeting in the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in December last year.

There is a great need for this.

What we have said does not at all mean that there are no shortcomings or derelictions in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the deputy group from the Ukraine. But we cannot be accused of reluctance to defend the interests of the republic, not contrasting them to general state interests and the interests of all the Soviet people.

We hope very much that our appeal to you will be met with understanding.

[Signed] Respectfully: [about 30 handwritten signatures follow that are mostly indistinct]

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia Issues Disobedience Decree 15 Apr

Actions Aim To Achieve Independence

AU1604113191 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0400 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Decree issued by Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia in Tbilisi on 15 April—read by announcer]

[Text] Recently, the peoples in the empire have strengthened the movement of political protests and strikes which aim to abolish the imperial central power and to further the process forming sovereign democratic states.

In connection with this and as a result of the situation in Samachablo [South Ossetia], and in protest against the so-called imperial policy of the center, the political organizations of the Roundtable have declared transportation strikes and strikes in enterprises subordinate to the Union. Proceeding from the view that the stated protest actions have one aim—the restoration of Georgia's complete de facto independence and its liberation from subordination to imperial structures and from the imperial dictate—and that they represent a direct continuation of the process of national and civil disobedience that has been proceeding in our country during the last few years, I decree that:

1. Ministries, departments, and administrative organs give all possible support to the national and civil disobedience that has been declared by the political organs of the Roundtable;

2. Officials form consultative and coordination councils that, together with strike committees, will (?establish a framework for) the movement of disobedience to avoid damaging the economic interests of the republic;

3. A united mass media council be established that, together with the Supreme Soviet press center and the president's press service, guarantees the dissemination abroad of correct and verified information concerning current processes in Georgia;

4. A special strike fund be set up that will provide all manner of assistance and security to strikers.

[Signed] Zviad Gamsakhurdia, president of the Republic of Georgia.
Tbilisi, 15 April.

Roundtable Urges Protest Actions

AU1604131091 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0400 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Statement issued by Roundtable political organizations in Tbilisi on 15 April—read by announcer]

[Text] On 9 April 1991, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia made a historic decision on the restoration of Georgia's independence and, in so doing, expressed the will of the Georgian people.

In spite of repeated appeals to Moscow's leaders from the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, they have no intention of resolving the problems of future mutual relations between Moscow and Georgia on the basis of negotiations and are turning to the use of force that is manifested in the introduction of new contingents of internal troops into Georgia and the aggressiveness of Soviet occupation troops against the peaceful population.

As a result, the Roundtable's political organizations call upon the Georgian nation and the entire population of Georgia to engage in national and civil disobedience and to continue all manner of protest strike actions. They declare their solidarity with the nations in the empire that are struggling for freedom and independence and express the hope that sovereign independent states will soon be formed on the ruins of the empire, states that will have just and good-neighborly relations between one another.

[Signed] The political organizations of the Roundtable. Tbilisi, 15 April 1991.

Reportage on Situation in South Ossetia

Large Weapons Seizure

LD1604182191 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 16 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valery Shanayev])

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 16 TASS—Four hundred pieces of firearms, a large amount of factory and handmade grenades, explosives, hail-combatting guns, walkie-talkies, as well as armored vehicles and tens of thousands of rounds of ammunition were seized by Soviet interior troops in South Ossetia in the past two days.

Some of the detained Georgian militants carried papers stating that they had been released from custody before the expiry of their terms of punishment and identity cards of Georgian interior force officers, TASS was told at the press centre of the extraordinary committee under the chairman of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet.

No electricity is supplied to Tskhinvali and gas and water supplies are sporadic. Despite these difficulties, classes have resumed in four schools, food shops have reopened, the public transport has resumed operations and barricades in the streets are being torn down.

As additional USSR interior troops arrive in South Ossetia and militants are being disarmed, refugees appeal to the military to help them return to their homeland in order to begin spring field work.

An increasing flow of refugees continues to flow into North Ossetia from other regions and cities of Georgia. More than 20,000 refugees, mainly children, women, senior citizens, sick and injured people, have been registered in Vladikavkaz.

Rockets Fired, Hostages Taken

AU1604153691 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian 1437 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] A report on the situation in Samachablo [South Ossetia]: Bringing in USSR Interior Ministry internal troops seems to have inspired Ossetian extremists to new deeds. Taking advantage of the absence of representatives of the Georgian militia from Georgian villages, the bandits resumed their attacks. Last night, at 2300 GMT, the Ossetian extremists fired rockets from the direction of Ossetian villages [names indistinct] on the Georgian village of (?Suisi). Several houses were damaged. Fortunately, there were no casualties.

It was reported yesterday that the road between Georgian villages in Tskhinvali Rayon was restored. Unfortunately, however, after the very first run, the movement of buses had to be halted. The point is that [words indistinct] near the entrance to Tskhinvali, the Ossetian extremists stopped a "Zhiguli" light automobile with servicemen in it. The soldiers were giving a lift to two residents of Tamarasheni [names indistinct]. The extremists took the latter as hostages. The leadership of the internal troops units stationed in Tskhinvali temporarily halted the movement of the buses and categorically demanded the release of the hostages from representatives of the Ossetian population.

No Shooting in Tskhinvali 14-15 Apr

AU1604114791 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0400 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The press center of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Georgia reports that, during the nights of 14 and 15 April, no shots were fired in Tskhinvali.

On 14 April, in the village of (?Dzviri), Geno Bestayev, a tractor driver, was working with some Georgian women when the group was attacked by Ossetian bandits who abducted Geno Bestayev and took his tractor. They told him that, as an Ossetian national, he has no right to work with Georgians.

On 15 April, the first buses left the territory of the Georgian Automobile Inspectorate for the villages of Achabeti, K'ekhvi, and Kurta. Presently, there are two buses a day. For security reasons, the buses are escorted by soldiers and armored personnel carriers.

Too Early for 'Positive Changes'

PM1504095591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Apr 91 p 1

[A. Bushev and A. Nesterenko report: "Transcaucasus: Caravans on the Move..."]

[Text] "I think that it is still too early to speak of any major positive changes," Colonel General Yu.V. Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops, said in response to a question about the situation in South Ossetia. "However, the operations launched 9 April to disarm the combatant sides' fighters are going successfully. For the first time in a long time Tskhinvali slept calmly, without shooting. The road from Dzhavi to Tskhinvali has been opened up to traffic."

The North Ossetia SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's Extraordinary Committee Press Center reports that operations in the area of Tskhinvalskiy Rayon's villages of Kekhvi and Tamarasheni over the last two days have produced the following results: More than 300 weapons, mainly rifles, and one armored personnel carrier have been confiscated.

Georgian Rail Situation 'Gradually Improving'

PM1604150191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Item from roundup of IZVESTIYA, SIBINFORM, TASS, and AFP reports: "Goods Trains Let Through, Passenger Trains Standing Idle"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA's correspondent was told at the Ministry of Railroads that all Transcaucasian Railroad junctions, apart from Veselaya Station, have been opened to train traffic.

Due to Georgia's refusal to admit trains, 3,500 freightcars carrying most diverse freight, including perishable goods, have piled up these days on the railroads around the republic. But the situation is gradually improving. Georgia has decided to let goods trains through. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision, adopted two days ago, to sell the goods to the population living in areas where freightcars are piling up seems to have had an effect.

There were 183 trains standing at junctions linking the Transcaucasian Railroad with other sections of railroad at 1800 hours 14 April.

Armenia Appeals To Renew Transport

LD1604164991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Yerevan, 16 Apr (TASS)—Armenia is completely cut off from the rest of the world "as a result of the strike by Georgian transport workers and the blockade from the Azerbaijan side," reports Artem Shakhbazyan, a correspondent of the ARMENPRESS agency.

For the third day, economic freight has neither entered nor been transported out of the republic. Dozens of trains have become stuck on the tracks approaching Idzhevan and Norashen. Meanwhile, there is a keenly felt shortage in Armenia of petroleum products, food, and construction materials for the disaster zone.

In connection with the critical situation, the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet has made an open statement to Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia that voices the hope that the new leadership of Georgia will restore railway communication as soon as possible and will find it possible to allow transit trains for Armenia to pass through Georgia.

Strike Cuts Off Armenia 'Completely'

LD1704081991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0706 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Freight is not getting into Armenia for the third day now. A critical situation has developed. Armenia is completely cut off from the rest of the world because of the strike by Georgian transport workers. The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium has issued an open statement to President Zviad Gamsakhurdia of Georgia. It expresses the hope that the Georgian leadership will restore railway communications as rapidly as possible.

Georgian Trade Unions Appeal for Support

AU1604131891 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0400 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] The Georgian Confederation of Independent Trade Unions has sent an appeal to the World Trade Union Organization in which it explains the existing complicated situation in Georgia and asks the World Trade Union Organization to support the Republic of Georgia during this difficult time as it struggles for independence and for a halt to the aggression on Georgian land.

Form Strike Committee

AU1704085491 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0400 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] During the last few days, the sociopolitical situation in the republic has become extremely acute as a result of the occupation of Samachablo [South Ossetia], a part of Georgia, by the USSR Government. On the initiative of workers, strikes and meetings have begun as a mark of protest. A spontaneous strike movement has spread throughout the whole republic.

For the purpose of organizing the strikes, strike committees will be formed in large enterprises subordinate to the Union, including, first and foremost, transportation enterprises.

In connection with the fact that a serious economic situation has been created in the republic and given the necessity of enabling workers in individual enterprises and establishments to determine the forms and directions of the strike so that the least possible damage is done to our economy and with the aim of elaborating a single tactic regarding consultations and the unification and coordination of efforts of individual organizations, the Georgian Confederation of Independent Trade Unions has adopted a decision on the creation of a committee for the strike movement.

The strike movement's committee will be located in the building of the Georgian Confederation of Independent Trade Unions.

National Program Called Armenian Party's Salvation

NC1604152391 Yerevan HAYASTAN in Armenian 2 Apr 91 pp 1, 2

[Article by candidate of philosophical sciences R. Avagyan, under the "Situation and Standpoint" rubric: "The Way Out of the Situation"]

[Excerpts] Having been a member of the CPSU for nearly 30 years, I reflect with pain and bitterness upon those processes that caused the loss of prestige for the most powerful party that once appeared unshakable. [passage omitted]

The restoration of the party's prestige depends primarily on radical changes in the content and method of its activities, in particular on the consistent implementation of the national program which forms the nucleus of its strategy. As has been noted in the guidelines of the Armenian Communist Party's program, this national program aims at establishing and bolstering national statehood in the interest of the economic and political autonomy of an independent Armenia. To put it more concretely: "The guiding principles of the Armenian Communist Party are the achievement of national unity, the reunification of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast with the motherland on the basis of self-determination, the acceptance of the supremacy of the national values, and the attainment of national, social and cultural progress."

Restoration of the party's prestige will directly depend on each practical step the Armenian Communist Party takes to protect the national interests. Such an approach might turn out to be the only way to regain the confidence of the masses. [passage omitted] Restoration of the party's prestige is closely connected with the successful conclusion of the party's internal cleansing. It should radically transform itself into a political organization with new functions, activities, and renewed content. [passage omitted]

'Bandit Attacks' Reported in Nagorno-Karabakh

NC1604095991 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1950 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] Nagorno-Karabakh was relatively calm over the weekend, which in Nagorno-Karabakh terms means no one was killed. As far as other sorts of acts of lawlessness, such as armed attacks on settlements and citizens, are concerned, such things are regular occurrences here.

Thus, according to information being received, Azerbaijani bandits continue to fan the flames of the explosive situation. On 14 April they again fired upon Yegtsaog village, while at around 1850 on the same day an animal farm in Askeranskiy Rayon came under fire.

The situation was tense for residents of (?Musatag) village in Mardakertskiy Rayon yesterday. A group, some of whose members wore militia uniforms, attacked people working in the fields from the direction of Mir-Bashirskiy Rayon. A land reclamation specialist, [name indistinct] Sargisyan, was shot in the leg during the attack.

An almost four-hour intensive exchange of fire took place between Martuni and the nearby Azerbaijani villages of (?Kochashen) and Amirallar.

All these bandit attacks took place after the Azerbaijani leadership had issued a call for a moratorium on all acts of violence, including livestock theft.

NKAO Residency Act Move Against Armenians

NC1304132491 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 11 Apr 91

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent Dzhivan Balagyozyan: "Permits in Repayment for Massacres"]

[Text] Yerevan, 11 Apr (ARMENPRES)—NOVOSTI reports that the Azerbaijan Republic's Cabinet of Ministers had decided that residents of Baku and Sumgait, "where the problems of employment and housing are acute," should have the right to move into the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] to live and work without losing residential rights in Baku and Sumgait.

The residents of these two cities, who have become the symbols of the bloody crime perpetrated on interethnic grounds, are receiving unusual "identity cards." They are receiving privileges to move not just anywhere but to Nagorno-Karabakh, whose population has become the victim of its own natural aspiration to become a part of the historical homeland. Will this not mean a peculiar sort of exoneration for the participants in that revelry of death which took place in these cities of Azerbaijan?

The political cover of this initiative is obvious. Through such immoral "permits," the Azerbaijani leadership is trying to alter the demographic character of the oblast, whose native and majority population is made up of Armenians. In effect, Azerbaijan's calculated, sanctioned and far-reaching policy of the Azerbaijanization of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh] has started. It appears that the latest visit of the republic's president, A. Mutalibov, to Nagorno-Karabakh was not a mere isolated event.

Yerevan Says Moscow Behind Region's Tensions

NC1304131191 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 12 Apr 91

[Text] Yerevan, 12 Apr (ARMENPRES)—The Operations Department of the Armenian Internal Affairs Ministry has been flooded with information from various areas concerning attacks carried out by the members of Azerbaijani Special Purpose Detachments on border regions of the republic.

Here are the latest figures: Shurnukh village in Gorisskiy Rayon came under fire from the forest near Seytas village of Azerbaijan's Kubatlinskiy Rayon at around 2000 on 8 April. The bullets left their trace on the buildings. Two days later, members of the Special Purpose Militia near Avush village in Nakhichevan's Ilichevskiy Rayon fired battlefield and automatic weapons and cannons for a few hours trying to provoke a response. The road section between Aygepar and Movses villages in Tavushskiy Rayon of Armenia came under automatic fire from the direction of Alibeyli village in Azerbaijan's Tauzskiy Rayon. A passenger bus bound for Aygedzor village came under fire and one woman was injured.

Is this a coincidence or planned operations by the Azerbaijani guerrillas who have been given the status of official guardians of law and order? We do not believe it is a coincidence. The unending series of armed attacks confirm that this is a planned operation. Its aim is to further exacerbate the situation in the region. This is in someone's interest, but in whose? It appears that it is in the interest of the central authorities. Otherwise why would certain official state bodies be giving dubious and exceedingly biased views of the regional events in their statements in the mass media? They are creating the impression that everything is not in order in Armenia.

The center in no way could reconcile itself to the fact that, in its perception, the "inimical" Armenia is pursuing too much of an autonomous policy and is getting ready for a referendum which will determine the republic's future. This is why public opinion is being shaped against Armenia so calculating. It remains to be seen if this mass shaping of public opinion will follow more stern measures by the center. A hint in this direction was already signaled during the USSR president's speech at the latest meeting of the Federation Council.

Reportage on Armenian, Azerbaijani Relations

LD1604213391 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Text] Baku April 16 AZERINFORM-TASS—Separatist forces in Armenia and their messengers in Stepanakert change tactics but continue to press for the alienation of Nagorno-Karabakh from Azerbaijan, agents of the Azerbaijani State Security Committee told AZERINFORM upon their return from Nagorno-Karabakh.

Following recommendations and orders of Armenia's most reactionary forces, the leaders of the movement skillfully manipulate political sentiments and views of the population, directing them towards continuous confrontation and distrust in the Azerbaijani Government. They seek to stimulate unconstitutional actions of Armenians and gangs of militants.

The unlawful use of firearms and various other criminal actions have grown much more frequent since the beginning of this year. Criminal gangs have become much better organized and their actions more audacious. These groups are made up of Armenians who have arrived in the region for the purpose.

Azerbaijani security agents have repeatedly prevented criminal actions against civilians. In 1990, they organized and conducted eight operations to end the activity of ten gangs.

Regarding civilian Armenians they are inclined to work in order to improve relations with Azeris.

Security agents believe that efforts should be made to prevent the penetration of Armenian militants into Nagorno-Karabakh and send those already there out of the region. This is the only effective way towards peace in Nagorno-Karabakh, they say.

x x x

Yerevan April 16 ARMENPRESS-TASS—The Presidiums of the Armenian legislature and the Council of Ministers issued a joint statement addressed to all republics of the Soviet Union.

The statement says that Azerbaijan's leadership seeking to further deepen confrontation of the two peoples has resorted to extreme anti-Armenian measures. Infringements on the rights and lives of Armenians have reached the degree of sheer barbarity, the statement says.

The power and pressure policy is being pursued along all lines. The railroad is fully blocked, gas supplies to Armenia have dwindled dramatically. Azerbaijan has actually switched over to open military aggression against the Armenian republic, the statement stresses.

It also points out that under these conditions the federal leadership fails to take steps to stop the escalation of violence and continues to arm Azerbaijan directly helping aggression.

The Armenian leadership appeal to all Soviet republics to speak out in protest and impose on Azerbaijan economic sanctions envisaged by international law.

'Tense' Border Situation, Armenian Attacks Noted

NC1704072891 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 17 Apr 91

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Despite the statement issued by the republic's leaders, the situation in the border rayons remains tense. Various [words indistinct] have been published on the matter.

Azerbaijan's Tauzskiy Rayon and Armenia's Shamshadinskiy Rayon have agreed to take measures to reduce tension and end armed activities along their border. The two sides also agreed to meet on 17 April. Nevertheless, Armenian bandits fired on the town of Akkend in Zangelanskiy Rayon from Armenia's Kafanskiy Rayon.

According to a report by the Republic of Azerbaijan's Ministry of Internal Affairs, a [word indistinct] vehicle which belonged to [words indistinct] came under automatic weapons fire near Martuninskiy Rayon on 16 April. Two people were killed and another two wounded in the attack.

Central Asia

Constituent Congress for New Kazakh TU Held

PM1504084791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Oleg Stefashin: "Kazakh Miners' Constituent Congress"]

[Text] Karaganda—Miners in the Karaganda and Ekibastuz coal basins have held a constituent congress at which a republic federation of the coal industry workers' trade union was established.

In the miners' opinion, they need it, above all, to strengthen protection for the socioeconomic interests of miners and members of their families under conditions of a market economy and the exacerbated political struggle. The new federation is entrusted, in particular, with monitoring the fullness of the consumer basket and the changing index of prices of goods and services regarding the growth in wages. It will also influence the decisions of state and economic organs on the full or partial liquidation of coal industry enterprises and on the defining of the limits of their independence. The congress empowered its Central Committee to hold talks with the republic government and to conclude agreements with it on behalf of labor collectives.

It is proposed that, with the creation of the federation, the workers movement in coal basins will acquire broader scope and a somewhat different direction. It is becoming obvious that the slogan politics conducted by worker (strike) committees no longer suit the miners, and many of them are beginning to pin their future hopes on renewed trade unions.

Retail Sales of Kyrgyz Newspapers Suspended

91P50157A Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Apr 91 p 1

[Report by E. Ekmatov: "Newspapers Are Only for Subscribers"]

[Text] For the first time in many years kiosks in the Republic of Kyrgyzstan have not received local publications. Retail sales of newspapers are suspended as of now.

The reason is that there is no paper. The publishing house has been supplied with only 60 percent of its paper needs. "We have enough paper on hand to meet subscriptions until August," said V. Denisyuk, director of the Kyrgyz Communist Party Central Committee's publishing house.

Having learned that republic publications are not making it to the retail network, I stopped by a kiosk located not far from the newspaper office. Its windows were literally filled with newspapers published both in the republic and beyond its borders. The kiosk cashier, indicating them spread her arms.

"It is all pulp literature," she said. "No one wants it."

Here is a question: Where do they get their paper if there is not enough to meet basic stock deliveries?

Turkmenia Aiming for Self-Sufficiency in Grain

PM1504151191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Apr 91 First Edition p 6

[Correspondent M. Volkov report: "Flour for 8 Kopeks"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—Turkmenia is counting on becoming fully self-sufficient in grain under the Grain Program it has developed. It intends to supply the population with its own flour, which, incidentally, remains at 41 kopeks per kilogram in accordance with the decree of Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] President S. Niyazov.

Prices for pasta products have also been maintained in the republic. Specific local features have thus been taken into account. Hard-working farms, however, are already supplying their fellow citizens with sweet-smelling Turkmen bread. For example, G. Mukhamedov, doctor of sciences and chairman of Ashkhabadskiy Rayon's Makhtumkuli Kolkhoz, did not stretch the kolkhoz program out over a long period, but sharply increased the area sown to winter cereals last fall.

I have just paid a visit to the kolkhoz watermill. The farm has no problems with flour, and it costs the kolkhoz members... 8 kopeks per kilogram.

No Price Increase on Bread in Uzbekistan

91P50148A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
4 Apr 91 p 3

[Article by M. Babintsev: "The Prices Have Started Rolling"; Subheading: "Our Correspondents Reported Yesterday From....Uzbekistan"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] In Uzbekistan, the current prices for bread, flour, bread items and macaroni products will remain the same for the remainder of this year. Nearly 2 billion rubles [R] have been allocated from the republic budget to compensate for the resulting expenditures. Prices have also been kept the same for some other products of basic necessity. So, R600 million of government funds have been allocated just for the sale to the population of medicines, coal, natural gas and other fuels, which are in high demand among families with many children, pensioners, and people who live in villages.

Of course, the price increases have had an effect on the budget of each and every family. The first day [of price increases], however, has shown that in the majority of the republic's towns and villages people have responded with understanding to this necessary measure. There were no public speeches, mass meetings, or hostilities.

"Price increases, are not the major problem yet," says chairman of the Chinaz Rayon consumer union, G. Anarbaeva. "All goods have to be delivered to the consumer correctly, with personal responsibility. This is why we are tracking this so carefully now."

The new retail price reform is now in force, and the Uzbekistan government intends to take additional measures for the social protection of the population. Tomorrow will show what form they will take.

Tajik Law on Registration of Enterprises

914A0562A

For the law on Registration of Enterprises published in the 28 February 1991 KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-017, dated 8 April 1991, pages 32-33.

Turkmen Law on 1991 Development Plan

914A0481A

For the Law on 1991 Development Plan published in the 31 January 1991 TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-017, dated 8 April 1991, pages 60-67.

Uzbek Draft Law on Business Undertakings

914A0501A

For the draft law on business undertakings published in the 9 January 1991 PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-017, dated 8 April 1991, pages 33-38.

Uzbek Law on 1991 State Budget

914A0591A

For the 1991 State Budget Law published in the 22 February 1991 PRAVDA VOSTOKA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-017, dated 8 April 1991, pages 38-41.